JPRS 77891

21 April 1981

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1125

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

JPRS 77891

21 April 1981

USSR REPORT

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1125

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Recent Socialist Gains Over Capitalist System Highlighted
(MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, Jan 81) 1

West Blamed for Obstructing Arms Control Agreement
(G. Yevgen'yev; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIY, Jan 81) 13

Intensification of Economic Crisis in West Explained
(Viktor Aronovich Cheprakov; RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR, Jan-Feb 81) 25

Conference on Development of Socialist Ideas in Third World
(A.N. Berkan', V.V. Prozorovskiy; RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR, Jan-Feb 81) 35

Briefs
Diplomats Learning Portuguese 45

NATIONAL

Finnish Paper: USSR Scientist on Urals Nuclear Accident
(Pekka Walden; UUSI SUOMI, 9 Feb 81) 46

REGIONAL

Azeri Economists Discuss Impact of Urbanization in Republic
(Asef Nadirov, Sofig Huseynov; KOMMUNIST, Jan 81) 47

RECENT SOCIALIST GAINS OVER CAPITALIST SYSTEM HIGHLIGHTED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 1, Jan 81 (signed to press 6 Jan 81) pp 4-19

[Article: "Socialism and Capitalism at the Outset of the Eighties"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet people and the peoples of the sister socialist countries have a right to be proud. Socialism has clearly proved its viability, has assumed a firm position in the world economy of our day, and has become the most dynamically developing part of it. Despite repeated attempts on the part of the imperialist powers to impede its progress through intervention and economic blockades, various trade limitations and discrimination, on the whole the socialist system of property has managed to retain equality in international economic relations.

Increased political and ideological influence of socialism and its role in world development are also clearly manifested in the expansion of the front of the struggle against imperialism and the further advancement of revolutionary forces that are acting beyond the borders of the socialist part of the world. The very existence of world socialism, its economic and political power, and the extensive activity of socialist countries in the international arena, under modern conditions, constitute a factor that is increasingly contributing to the successes of these forces. At the same time the workers' movement in capitalist countries and the national liberation movement are objectively natural allies of socialism in the struggle against the aggressive policy of imperialism and for the triumph of the ideals of social progress and true democracy and humanism. Their successes contribute to consolidating the positions of socialism and improve international conditions for socialist and communist construction.

In the zone of the national liberation movement this interconnection between the efforts of world socialism and the revolutionary process is manifested most strikingly in the changeover in the number of developing countries to the path of socialist orientation and the strengthening of anti-imperialist tendencies in the policies of many young national states which, naturally, raises the level of their solidarity with the socialist countries.

The Economy and the Economic Policy

The fact that real socialism has attained new heights of economic construction is of permanent historical significance. This is the result of a difficult struggle. The development of the capitalist formation, although it was historically doomed,

confirmed that its downfall would certainly not be automatic. In the sphere of the economy capitalism managed to take advantage of a number of specifically favorable circumstances which arose after World War II. It is seeking reserves for its survival in the mastery of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, structural advances in the economy and internationalization of production, and it is trying to direct many of the countries that have been released from colonial oppression along the capitalist path. Joining the power of monopolies with the power of the bourgeois state and state-monopolistic control of public production have become the main direction of its development. Despite the deepening of inter-imperialist contradictions, the solidarity of the monopolistic bourgeoisie in its opposition to world socialism has increased. Capitalism has unleased against it an arms race that is unprecedented in peace time and is practicing discriminatory actions in trade.

All this makes the competition between the two systems, like any other form of class struggle, clearly different from any smooth road along which the locomotive of history completes its journey according to a predetermined schedule.

Indeed at the outset of the 1980's the socialist community provides approximately one-third of the world industrial output, which is three-fourths of the volume of industrial output of the countries of developed capitalism--our main competitors in economic competition. The historic tendency toward a reduction of this difference has not changed. No large problems in the sphere of world economic ties can now be resolved without the participation of the socialist countries or without taking into account the experience of real socialism. Socialism has introduced into this area qualitatively new principles of cooperation which are increasingly being introduced into trade agreement practice and are sustaining the process of restructuring international economic relations on just democratic principles. The socialist states, acting as an alternative source of funds and technology which are necessary for the development of liberated countries, and rendering them all-around support in the struggle for economic decolonialization, are radically changing the alignment of forces among them and their former mother countries. The crisis-free and aggressive growth of the socialist economy exerts a stabilizing influence on world markets and general market conditions.

The objective laws of economic and social development are working against capitalism --this "prehistory of human society."[1] Socialism is opening up an epoch of true history. All the experience of its development has shown that it is precisely socialism that is the shortest path to surmounting backwardness and effectively developing productive forces, that it exerts a revolutionizing influence on the peoples of other states--both liberated and industrial. Developed capitalist countries are attentively examining how the world socialist system is successfully solving such global problems of modernity as the energy, ecology, raw-material and currency problems, and they are studying the practice of planning and management of a highly developed economy which is an alternative to capitalism.

Even the apologists of capitalism are forced to admit the limits of the possibilities of the capitalist methods of production on these fronts of the economic and scientific-technical competition between the two systems.

The opposing nature of the social development of the two antagonist social systems was manifested with special force in the late 1970's. There developed in the world

of capitalism the worst and deepest economic crisis of the post-war period which, as was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress, also spread to all the main centers of the capitalist economy.

The consequences and recurrences of this crisis have not been overcome even yet, and even in 1980 the United States and a number of other large capitalist countries began to drift into another economic crisis.

Of course the Soviet economy also had its problems during that period. We are speaking about the unfavorable weather conditions, the transfer of the mining industry to the North and to the East, and shortcomings in planning and administration of the economy, of which the CPSU Central Committee quite frankly notified the party and the people at the October (1980) Plenum. To see clearly the problems that are not yet solved and to draw up a clear-cut program for solving them has always been the rule of the party's economic policy.

Indeed, despite these problems the USSR has again doubled the volume of its industrial output in the past ten years (which, considering the current level, would take the United States 16 years, France--17 years, the FRG--18 years, and England--26 years), and has outstripped the United States in the production of petroleum, steel, mineral fertilizer and cotton fabrics, as well as in terms of capital investments and cargo turnover with all kinds of transportation, and the average annual absolute increase in the production of many kinds of raw material, equipment and consumer goods. The national income and the industrial output of the CEMA countries increased twice as fast during that period as it did in the capitalist states, capital investments increased five times as fast as in the EEC, and so forth.

Because of its peculiarities the economic crisis of the middle of the 1970's, which embrace the entire world of capitalism, and its subsequent recurrences could not clear the path for any subsequent rapid development of production. Beyond the chronological frame of the crisis phase there remained unchecked inflation, mass unemployment, and underloading of industrial capacities. Therefore there is every reason to assume that capitalism faces a long period of relatively low rates of economic development (although, perhaps, higher than in the 1970's, but clearly lower than in the 1960's) with a general deterioration of conditions for expanded reproduction.

All this creates more favorable possibilities for socialism in the historical competition between the two systems. Still these possibilities in themselves, the present and future foes of capitalism, must not be grounds either for complacency or for fiscal optimism. In the 1980's the monopolistic bourgeoisie will still have a powerful industrial and financial apparatus as well as experience in administration and social maneuvering, including the experience drawn from the lessons of the results of the 1970 crisis and the changing situation in the modern world.

There is a very great deal to be done in the USSR national economy as well. "During the 1980's," said L. I. Brezhnev at the October (1980) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "there should be an economic changeover to intensive development, and the productivity and quality of labor should increase sharply." Correspondingly the "main directions for the economic and social development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the period up to 1990" envisions under the Eleventh Five-Year Plan increasing the national income that is used for consumption and accumulation by 18-20 percent and the production of industrial products--by 26-28 percent, and increasing the

productivity of public labor by 17-20 percent, obtaining as a result an increase in national income of no less than 85-90 percent.

These indicators are appreciably higher than those with which bourgeois prognosticians predicted for their countries during this period. But one must take into account that to fulfill the earmarked tasks and to achieve results which will raise us to new heights in economic competition with capitalism is possible only by raising the mechanism of control and planning and methods of management and executive discipline to the level of modern requirements and increasing the peoples' feeling of efficiency, responsibility, initiative and creativity.

The International Policy

The influence and authority of real socialism is increasing clearly and appreciably in the sphere of international relations. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and all countries of the socialist community, which combines firm resistance to aggression with constructive love of peace, exerts a mighty positive influence on the world situation and contributes to the creation of favorable external conditions for the successful construction of socialism and communism, for the development of movements for social and national liberation, and for the development of the entire revolutionary process.

Revolutionary renewal of the society is inseparable from the strengthening of general security. These processes, which have their own particular patterns, are closely interwoven and reinforce one another. This is convincingly shown by the past decade.

In the 1970's the world witnessed the acceleration and intensification of the world revolutionary process. As was shown above, the countries of the socialist community, confidently outstripping capitalism in decisive areas of the historical competition, reached new heights of economic and social development and the strengthening of their defense capabilities. The peoples of many developing countries and all detachments of the national liberation movement dealt strong blows to imperialism and to neocolonialism. In the industrial countries of capitalism the proletariat and the broad masses of workers increased their struggle against the domination of the monopolies and for radical democratic transformations.

And during that same period, primarily as a result of the implementation of the Leninist foreign political course of the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses and the multi-faceted and active work of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, there was a significant improvement of the world's political climate. Detente replaced the cold war. Peaceful coexistence of states with differing social structures began to be filled with concrete political and economic content. More favorable prerequisites were created for just peaceful regulation of disputes, and effective measures were taken to hold back the arms race.

But the organic interconnection between the process of revolutionary renewal of the world and the process of ensurance of international security is also conditioned by the fact that difficulties and obstacles arising on the path of one of them finally can not but be reflected in the development of the other. And this is quite understandable for the main forces which oppose deep social changes and the consolidation of general peace are essentially one and the same--the most reactionary and militant

groupings of the monopolistic bourgeoisie. It is precisely these forces which are doomed by history which, under the conditions of the deepening of the overall crisis of capitalism, again and again try to achieve their narrow selfish goal through aggravating the opposition both on the fronts of the open class struggle and in the field of interrelations between states with differing social systems.

The reliance of imperialism on "rigidity" and the historical dispute with socialism and all other revolutionary forces of modernity only demonstrates its weakness. Nobody is capable of reversing the progressive development of mankind. But, as experience shows, the counterattack of imperialism is capable of appreciably complicating both the development of the world revolutionary process and the restructuring of international relations on a peaceful, just and democratic basis.

This took place during the 1970's and 1980's. The aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily the United States, reacted to the consolidation of the peaceful positions of socialism, the successes of the national liberation movement and the growth of all peace-loving democratic forces with a sharp increase in the opposition to these positive changes in the modern world. They followed a course toward rearranging the existing alignment of forces in the world arena, primarily the military balance, in their own favor and to the detriment of the Soviet Union and the socialist community, in spite of the interests of international detente and the security of nations.

For the sake of the achievement of these goals which are dangerous for the cause of peace and social progress, the militant forces of imperialism are stepping up the arms race, charging the atmosphere with tension and bringing gross pressure to bear on independent states. The ruling circles of the United States have turned to economic "sanctions" against the Soviet Union and curtailment of scientific-technical, cultural and other ties with it, and they have unilaterally failed to meet many commitments that they have made and violated contracts and agreements they have signed. Anti-Sovietism and anti-communism in the imperialist policy have become means of fighting not only against the USSR and its allies, progressive forces in general, but also against all proponents of detente and peaceful international cooperation.

The interaction of anti-Soviet and anti-detente actions of aggressive circles of the West, primarily the United States, and also the Chinese leadership which, for the sake of achieving its own hegemonic goals, is striving to provoke a headon contact between the major forces of socialism and capitalism constitute another dangerous phenomenon in world politics.

The international situation has become seriously complicated. But when evaluating the events that have taken place there is no cause for pessimism and certainly not fatalism. The alignment of forces in the world arena that has taken form in the past decade has become a definite and stable factor in international development. No sudden attacks can destroy this basis of the interrelations between states of the two systems. Imperialism has irrevocably lost the capability of arbitrarily deciding the fate of mankind, and any attempts to regain this capability, even the most desperate ones, are futile for they inevitably come up against the reality of the modern world whose development is increasingly being determined by the historical laws of our epoch.

The global balance of forces throughout the postwar period has become more and more favorable for the cause of peace and progress. A decisive factor here was that

socialism, during the course of competition with capitalism, has realized its advantages as the leading social system, primarily in the socio-economic sphere, and has become a major bulwark of all revolutionary and liberation movements. But it is precisely because imperialism has suffered defeat after defeat in this main area of historical competition that it has opposed socialism with the policy of "from a position of strength." Despite the dominant long-term tendency of more rapid growth of the sources of peace and progress, during the first postwar years a situation was created in which it became vitally important for socialism to respond in the shortest period of time to the gauntlet that was thrown down to it by imperialism in the military sphere--primarily to eliminate the nuclear monopoly and strategic invulnerability of the United States.

At the price of an immense expenditure of efforts and resources the Soviet Union created a defense capability that is no way inferior to the military capabilities of the United States. The strategic military balance that was achieved between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism was a conquest of principal, truly historical significance. Imperialism was deprived of the capability of unleashing a world war with impunity by using weapons of mass destruction, and its global aggressive aspirations were held in check. Having neutralized he main military threat on the part of the United States and NATO, the Soviet Union and the socialist community thus contributed decisively to a situation where the historical competition between the two world systems began to enter a non-military area, the area of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social structures. Gobal strategic parity served as an important stimulus for political detente, and an initial point for preventing a further increase in military potential and reducing supplies of accumulated arms on the basis of equality and the same amount of security.

The hopes of aggressive imperialist circles to achieve military supremacy were unfounded. The strategic situation in the world became irreversible and it was impossible for the existing military balance to fluctuate. Any forced development of the militaristic programs of the United States and their partners in the North Atlantic block can be nullified by a corresponding increase of the defense power of the USSR and other states participating in the Warsaw Pact. As a result the balance was strengthened on a high level, at the price, of course, of large additional material expenditures and to the detriment of international stability. Therefore the only reasonable and realistic thing was for military and strategic equality to remain as a cornerstone for normal relations between states of the two world systems. It is also absolutely necessary to continue the process of limiting arms and military activity and advancing toward real disarmament.

The intrigues of the enemies of peace and socialism are being countered by a constant strengthening of the unity of all progressive forces of modernity.

Cooperation among the sister countries of socialism is becoming deeper in the political, economic, defense and other areas, the militant union of the states participating in the Warsaw Pact is becoming stronger, and the constructive activity of the CEMA is expanding. The solidarity and unity of actions of the international communist and workers' movement are becoming stronger. All-around cooperation is developing more and more closely between the Soviet Union and the socialist community, on the one hand, and, on the other, such countries as Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, Syria, South Yemen and others, and their solidarity with all other detachments of the national liberation struggle is increasing.

The profound strides that have been made in the system of interrelations among states with opposing social systems that took place in the 1970's have become an important factor in obstructing the policy of the imperialist dictatorship. Detente has served as a powerful accelerator of mutually advantageous cooperation in political, economic, scientific and cultural areas. Especially appreciable concrete results were produced in Europe by the practical implementation of the Helsinki agreements and the development of the general European process of ensuring security and expansion of cooperation. Now not only the socialist countries--the initiators of the detente--but also many state activists of the West see the unquestionable advantages of improving the political climate and are not inclined to support those who are trying to destroy everything positive that has been created through collective efforts over the course of a number of years.

Almost all of the countries of the European continent are becoming more aware that there is no reasonable, acceptable alternative to the policy of detente, and there is increased interest in continuing this realistic policy and filling it with concrete new content. The general European conference in Madrid is called upon to play an important role in this. The success of the Madrid meeting will depend on the political will of all its participants and the creation of a constructive atmosphere there, a climate of cooperation, and on their resolve not to undertake any actions which will lead to a political confrontation. The Madrid meeting could play an important role in surmounting the tense military opposition on the continent and help to develop unimpeded exchange on a European-wide scale in such areas as trade, industrial cooperation, energy, transportation, agricultural cooperation, joint scientific research, and the implementation of the Helsinki agreements in the spheres of culture, education, information and contact between people.

Both in Europe and throughout the world the detente, for which the USSR and all of its allies and friends struggled so long and persistently, has become one of the most characteristic features of international life. Even ferocious enemies of peace and progress are not capable of erasing it. During the past decade it has been possible to create such impressive possibilities for detente that in the current disturbing period it serves as a reliable support base both for repulsing sudden attacks on the process of improvement of the political climate in the world and for further advancing along the path of peaceful international cooperation. By opposing detente the aggressive circles of imperialism and the Chinese hegemonists are opposing not only the Soviet Union and the socialist community, but also all nations.

In today's world there are many of the most diverse hotbeds of contradictions, potentially explosive conflicting situations, and complex international problems that do not submit to simple and rapid solutions. But still one general objective need which is more significant than all the others is the need to preserve peaceful conditions for the existence of the human society.

In a most complex situation the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet state are displaying truly Leninist restraint, firmness and adherence to principle by defending and implementing the course toward consolidation of peace, the ensurance of security of the Soviet people and international security as a whole, without submitting to provocations and at the same time repulsing imperialist encroachments. The USSR and its allies and friends are waging a persistent struggle to preserve detente as the dominant tendency in world policy and to provide for normal peaceful coexistence

of states with differing social structures and avert the threat of a world thermonuclear conflict.

The deep positive strides that have been made in the alignment of forces in the world arena have been the result primarily of the interaction of two processes--the revolutionary renewal of the world and the ensurance of international security. The objective capabilities and the active works of powerful socio-political forces make it realistically feasible not only to avoid slipping into another cold war, but also to further strengthen the influence of these processes of the development of human society in the interests of peace and social progress.

The Struggle of Ideas and Classes

The end of the 1960's and the 1970's were marked by new, essentially important phenomena in the development of the international workers' and general democratic movements. The history of these years decisively refuted the ideas of bourgeois and ultra-leftist ideologists concerning the exhaustion of the revolutionary potential in the industrially developed capitalist society, of the "bourgeoisization" and "de-proletarianization" of the working class of the capitalist countries.

Even with relatively favorable economic market conditions in these countries the majority of the working class was able to escape the threat of "class peace" and "social partnership" which bourgeois ideology and propaganda increasingly placed before the workers as payment for entry into the kingdom of "material abundance" and "mass consumption." Behind the more refined and camouflaged forms of exploitation the working class was able to see their unchangingly antihuman essence, and behind the latest, externally liberal and reformed social tactics of capitalism they saw the desire to consolidate and expand the total dominance of monopolies in the society, to suppress the growing demands and needs of the workers. The mighty upsurge of the mass struggle of the working class during the 1960's and 1970's and the increase in the strike movement, including in the FRG and other countries which previously had considered themselves some kind of sanctuaries of "class peace" reflected the increased social demands, the militant spirit and the public activity of the workers.

In a number of countries, for example in France in 1968 and in Italy in the autumn of 1969, the increased fervor of the class struggle led to a frontal attack of the main mass of workers against state monopolistic power, and to acute socio-political crises. A remarkable feature of many of the mass uprisings during that period was the advancement of demands that went far beyond the "usual" material concessions, a struggle for guarantees of the economic and social position of the workers, primarily for the right to work and for participation in making decisions that determine the conditions of their life and labor activity.

During those same years the proletarian movement became more active with regard to main issues of domestic and foreign policy. The working class again came out as the main force in the fight against facism and reactionism. In countries where facist regimes were overthrown--Greece, Portugal and Spain--it made the most significant contribution to the process of democratization of political structures. In scates with bourgeois democratic regimes, especially in Western Europe and Japan, the influential detachments of the workers' movement and the broad masses of workers are

coming out with increasing force against reactionary impulses of the ruling circles, their attempts to limit democratic rights and freedoms, against anti-democratic sallies of right and "left" extremists.

In recent years the political uprisings of the mass workers' movement has become more and more aggressive and constructive. They manifest a growing desire to develop course that is an alternative to the policy of the state monopolistic circles, particularly in the socio-economic sphere. Even many reformist trade unions, including those linked to the ruling social democratic parties, are going beyond the framework of the traditional trade unionism and trying to develop a system of priorities in state economic and social policy that corresponds to the interests of the workers.

All these new phenomena and tendencies in the workers' movement, of course, do not mean that it is changing over immediately to a fight for socialism, but they do mark a certain phase, a stage in the creation of the political, ideological and moral-psychological prerequisites for this struggle.

The working class of the capitalist countries has made and continues to make a weighty contribution to the improvement of the international situation and to the cause of detente, primarily on the European continent. At the beginning of the 1970's West German workers militantly supported the policy of normalization of relations between the FRG and the socialist countries, and in a number of West European states the workers' movement is decisively repulsing plans to apply neutron arms and to locate American medium-distance missiles on the continent. Even earlier the workers of many capitalist countries actively came out against American aggression in Vietnam. There has been a marked increase in the role of the workers' movement in the struggle for disarmament--at the present time not only communists and class trade unions, but also many reformist parties that have a labor base and trade union organizations are coming out against the policy of stepping up the arms race which is being conducted by the United States and NATO.

The economic crisis of the middle of the 1970's and the increased mass unemployment and inflation which have not been subsiding in all the subsequent years were a serious experience for the militant spirit and the socio-political activity of the working class of the capitalist countries. The cyclical crises of overproduction and the concomitant growth of the army of unemployed usually worsens the objective conditions for the class struggle and in the past, as a rule, the bourgeoisie has managed to take advantage of them for curtailing the strike movement and narrowing its scope. In the new socio-political situation that arose in the capitalist world in the 1970's, this tactic misfired. This time the crisis did not cause [illegible] lowering of the level of the strike battle in the majority of capitalist countries and since the end of the decade it has acquired new force.

The actions to protect employment have acquired a mass character. During the course of them the workers began extensively to apply more active, aggressive forms of struggle, for example, when enterprises and organizations engage in "the output of products without capitalists." The state-monopolistic policy of "economizing" on wages and social expenditures, which in fact was an attempt to emerge from the crisis at the expense of the workers, evoked powerful resistance from the working class. Attempts to enlist representative professional organizations in the realization of this policy failed on the whole: they led only to more aggravation of the contradictions between the ruling circles and the organized labor movement. All

these cases reflected the persistance and the irreversability of the new tendencies in the awareness and socio-political behavior of the working class, the entire level of its social merit, and the readiness to defend its interests in the fight against monopolies and the bourgeois state.

During the 1970's the militant ties between the working class and other working segments of the population became significantly stronger and the social base of their class alliances expanded. At the basis of this process lay the stronger anti-monopolistic feelings among the peasantry and farmers, the intelligentsia and various groups of white collar workers. One of the brightest events of the 1960's and 1970's was the powerful rise of the democratic student movement in which the younger generation of the intelligentsia expressed protest against the increased oppression of the monopolies and militarism as well as the norms of the bourgeois way of life.

During the past decade in the socio-political life of capitalist countries there has been a marked increase in the role of mass democratic movements that are in favor of solving crucial social problems in the interests of the workers: the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, the protection of democratic rights and freedoms, the preservation of the environment, the quality of mass individual and collective consumption, socio-economic and cultural development of individual localities and regions, and the rights of national minorities. These movements were objectively directed against the omnipotence of monopolistic capital and its anti-human influence on social life, which creates a basis for their merging with the labor movement and for the formation of a unified front for the anti-monopolistic struggle.

The upsurge of the class struggle in capitalist countries, the stronger anti-monopolistic feelings in the broadest segments of the working population, and their increased desire for social changes--all this increases the role of the political and ideological activity of the vanguard of the working class--the communist party. The 1970's were a serious practical test of the correctness of the strategic and tactical line of the communist parties and their ability to head the growing movement of the masses in a changing situation.

The correctness of the course of the communist parties toward unifying broad social and political forces in the struggle for anti-monopolistic transformations is proved, for example, by such facts as the expansion of the mass base of the movement for deep social transformations and the unprecedently rapid growth of the ranks of the communist party in France, which again confirmed its role as the most representative force of the French working class, the increased mass influence of the Italian communist party, which deepened the crisis of the bourgeois system of power in the country. Considerable successes are being achieved by the communist parties of Finland, Japan, the FRG, Greece, Denmark and a number of other capitalist countries. The political initiative of communists is playing a larger role in solving the most crucial socio-economic problems of their countries and in the struggle for peace and disarmament. Broad public response was evoked by the meeting of communist and workers' parties of Europe for peace and disarmament which was held in April 1980, and the program of immediate measures for ensuring international security on the continent.

The objective development of the situation and the course of the class struggle in the domestic and international arenas are raising more and more new problems for the

communist movement in capitalist countries, both theoretical and practical ones. The economic crisis of the 1970's and the sharp activization of aggressive forces of imperialism in the sphere of international politics has complicated the conditions of their activity and the development of the revolutionary process as a whole. Imperialist reactionaries are striving to take advantage of economic difficulties in order to move to the right in political life. Their ideologists and propagandists are trying to place the responsibility for these difficulties on the workers' movement and its so-called "unreasonable" demands, on those extremely limited social reforms that were carried out under the pressure of the masses under the conditions of economic growth. The increased instability of the socio-economic situation of the masses and their lack of confidence in the future are utilized by reactionary circles to promote conservative political ideas and to disparage progressive social programs.

The policy of undermining detente and inflating anti-Sovietism serves the same purposes. Imperialist circles are trying to divert the attention of the workers from the internal problems of their countries to the alleged "Soviet threat" and thus to create optimal conditions for curtailing the workers' and general democratic movement and stepping up the arms race.

As was already noted, on the whole monopolistic reactionaries have not succeeded in taking advantage of the changes in the economic situation and the international circumstances to suppress the militant potential of the working class and its struggle for its own interests. Nonetheless these factors, like the failure of various variants of the state monopolistic "improvement" of the economy, politically disoriented a certain part of the workers, and in certain segments of the population, intensified the mood of mistrust in the prospects of the political struggle.

Under the new conditions the problem of the political alliances of various labor and democratic forces became considerably more complicated. Social democratic and socialist parties, including those of the preceding period, entered into alliances with communists or strengthened the anti-imperialist statements in their platforms, in the face of a crisis were unable to hold clear-cut anti-monopolistic positions and decisively separate themselves from the anti-crisis policy of the bourgeoisie which was being conducted at the expense of the workers. But those who held governmental power during the time of the crisis openly adhered to this policy. The position of the social democratic parties was marked by considerable fluctuations and inconsistency regarding the main issues of foreign policy as well. All this in combination with increased anti-communist and anti-Soviet tendencies in the ideology and policy of a number of social democratic parties could not but weaken their intended rapprochement with communist parties.

Difficulties and contradictions in the development of the revolutionary process are not a new phenomenon. Under modern conditions they represent a kind of [illegible] the expansion of the social base of the anti-monopolistic movement, the joining to it of new social groups that are not adequately tempered in the political and ideological sense. During times of complication of the situation these groups are inclined to waver and are subject to the influence of reactionary forces. As for the reformist trends in the labor movement, certain positive changes which marked their evolution at the beginning of the 1970's did not lead to a serious profound revision of their ideological and political credo. All this, naturally, had an effect at the time of the aggravation of the socio-economic system in the capitalist countries and in the international scene.

At the same time the attempts of reactionary and militaristic forces to move to a counterattack against the left radical camp and to suppress the strivings of the masses toward improvement of the international situation did not succeed. Recent political events show a marked ebbing of the "conservative wave" in a number of capitalist countries and the persistence of progressive tendencies that have been manifesting themselves in the social and political life since the end of the 1960's and the beginning of the 1970's. This is shown, for example, by the serious defeat of rightest forces in the recent elections in the FRG and the radicalization of the labor movement in Great Britain which led to a left-wing labor party coming to power. Despite the wavering of social democracy, militaristic circles have not succeeded in returning it to cold war positions and dealing with a revision of the detente policy. Samples of public opinion in Western European countries show that mass segments of the population have supported the conservative policy less and less in recent years.[2]

In a situation where there is a sharp collision of opposing socio-political tendencies, the communist parties of the capitalist countries are waging a persistent and difficult struggle for rallying the masses of people around the platform of peace and democracy, and they are perfecting their strategy and tactics. Creatively developing this platform, the communist parties are striving in all ways to take into account the rich experience of the class struggle and they are analyzing its successes and failures. The generalization of the experience of the events of the 1970's became very significant in their work.

In this regard the problem of concrete forms of struggle for political alliances of the working class and the combination of agreements concluded on an international level with the organization of the mass movement are of primary interest for Marxist-Leninists. No less crucial is the problem of how to provide protection of revolutionary conquests while in all ways utilizing peaceful forms of struggle, the parliament and other bourgeois democratic institutions. Under the conditions of the consolidation of the forces of imperialist reactionaries, the activization of opponents of peaceful coexistence and their utilization of anti-Soviet policies and propaganda and slander of real socialism, the problem of strengthening and developing proletarian internationalism and international solidarity of all anti-imperialist forces becomes especially critical for communists. All these problems are being solved by the international communist movement in the process of creative development of their theory and policy as they are guided by the unshakeable principles and ideals of scientific socialism.

Socialism is entering the 1980's with great economic and scientific-technical potential and highly skilled personnel as a socially homogeneous society of crisis-free, constantly growing economy and true freedom and democracy, as a bulwark and standard-bearer of peace. This makes it possible for it to solve any problems, even the most complex ones and, as distinct from capitalism, to look confidently into the future.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Marx and F. Engels. "Soch." [Works], Vol. 17, p 553.

2. See "Euro-Barometer", Brussels, January, 1979.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1981

11772
CSO: 1807/76

WEST BLAMED FOR OBSTRUCTING ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIY in Russian No 1, Jan 81 (signed to press 6 June 81)pp 52-61

[Article by G. Yevgen'yev: "The Vienna Negotiations and the Struggle for Detente in Europe"]

[Text] More than seven years have passed since diplomatic and military representatives of 19 states began negotiations in the capital of Austria, Vienna, concerning mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. During this time more than 250 plenary sessions and a large number of unofficial meetings have been held. These have resulted in mutual understanding regarding certain aspects of future agreements. But, because of the positions of the NATO states, the Vienna forum has not yet entered its most important and responsible stage--the development of a draft of the future agreement.

In the current complex international situation, when aggressive circles of the United States are trying to increase tension and impose another, more costly and dangerous extension of the arms race on the people, it is especially important to step up efforts towards directed toward consolidating peace and security of states, eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and taking effective steps in the area of disarmament.

It was precisely this insistent need of the moment that was the focus of the appeal of the May (1980) conference of the Political Consultative Committee (PKK) of the states participating in the Warsaw Pact directed to state leaders, governments, parliaments and all social forces of the world to exert efforts to limit and curtail the arms race with the aim of rapidly reaching an agreement, and to immediately resume negotiations concerning those areas in which they were halted or broken off.

It is especially important to take decisive action in those negotiations concerning arms limitation where the positions of the participating states have come closer together as a result of the work that has been done and where the main thing that is required is the political will of the governments for their successful completion. This pertains particularly to the Vienna negotiations concerning mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The socialist states that were represented in the negotiations in Vienna are proceeding from the idea that all the necessary prerequisites for agreement have been met.

The representatives of the 19 participating states have clear reference points--coordinated decisions adopted in preparatory consultations which were approved by their governments. They include: the subject of the negotiations--mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments and measures related to this in Central Europe; the region of reduction, within which all measures developed in the negotiations must be implemented--the territories of the FRG, Belgium, Holland, Luxumburg, and also the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia; the states directly participating in the negotiations, troops and arms that are subject to reduction and limitation within this region[1]; and the principles for further agreements--reciprocity and protection of the security of any of the parties.

The objective realities that were brought to light by the Vienna negotiations, and above all the incompatability of the dangerous concentration of immense masses of troops and arms in Central Europe with the requirements of a really reliable security under the conditions of the nuclear missile age are now becoming even more pressing and critical because of the large-scale military preparations of the United States and other NATO countries, especially in the area of medium-distance nuclear weapons. Any military conflict in this region, taking into account the proximity of the armed groupings of the two military and political alliances, could spread to other parts of the continent and involve all of Europe in the conflagration--and not just Europe.

The states represented at the table of the Vienna negotiations are called upon to make a weighty contribution to the implementation of the points of the concluding document of the general European conference, and primarily to fulfill commitments to exert efforts directed toward reducing military opposition and toward contributing to disarmament, which is meant to promote political detente in Europe and strengthen its security.

Taking these circumstances into account, it would seem that there should be no special difficulties in reaching mutually acceptable agreements in Vienna. But the negotiations have been continuing for more than seven years now and so far they have not brought any appreciable positive result. What is the reason?

The main thing, undoubtedly, is the fact that since the very beginning of the negotiations the NATO countries have held an unconstructive and frequently simply obstructive position regarding the key issues under discussion. They are pursuing a goal which is incompatible with the interests of European security--to achieve unilateral military advantages, and to assure for themselves conditions for the curtailment which would essentially give them a free hand in implementing the long-term armament program adopted at the North Atlantic block and at the same time rigid limitations on armed forces and armaments of the parties of the Warsaw Pact.

In their first proposals the Western participants formulated the concept of the so-called "asymmetrical," that is, unequal, reduction of infantry troops of both sides in the region that was agreed upon. As a result, the four states of the Warsaw Pact --the USSR, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia--were actually meant to reduce their forces by more than three times more than the seven NATO countries--the United States, Great Britain, the FRG, Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands and Luxumburg. For example, even in the first stage the Soviet Union was to remove from Central Europe an entire tank army consisting of 68,000 men and 1,700 tanks in exchange for the

removal of small subdivisions, individually and without any military equipment and the arms of 29,000 American servicemen. Poland, whose population amounts to approximately half of that of the FRG, and whose army is correspondingly smaller than the West German Bundeswehr, according to Western estimates, was to have reduced the number of military servicemen by 40 percent more than the FRG would.

Trying to justify their claims for unilateral military advantages in the eyes of Western public opinion, representatives of the NATO states assert that in the Central European region the countries of the Warsaw Pact have some "significant superiority" in the number of infantry troops. According to their statements they amount to almost 150,000 men. Allusions are made to "serious differences" in the structures of the armed groupings that are opposing one another here.

But arguments of this kind do not square with the facts. Although there are certain differences in the structures of the armed forces as a result of the fact that each side has developed them in its own way, in fact this does not play a significant role because both sides have been approximately balanced for a long time. "The differences in the structures of the forces of each of the sides," emphasized L. I. Brezhnev, "are approximately equal to one another in the end."[2]

It should be noted that the existence of military equality between the NATO states and those of the Warsaw Pact was discussed by none other than the President himself, J. Carter (during the high-level American-Soviet meetings in 1979). In the annual report to Congress of the U.S. Defense Minister, J. Brown, which was published at the end of January 1980, it was also pointed out that in the region of Central Europe, there is "an approximate numerical equality" between the regular armed forces of NATO and of the Warsaw Pact.[3]

In following tactics of deliberately dragging out the development of practical agreements, the Western participants allude to the notion that further progress depends on the coordination of the numbers of military personnel of both sides in Central Europe. But they themselves are undermining this coordination. Representatives of the NATO countries insist in using their inflated and in no way substantiated estimates of the number of troops of the socialist states as initial data for determining the volumes of reductions. They refuse to give a reasonable answer to the question of the method by which these "data" were obtained.

The extremely doubtful nature of Western estimates is demonstrated by their evolution itself. In fact while at the beginning of 1973 (when preparatory consultations were taking place in Vienna) the number of troops of the socialist states was officially determined by Washington at 730,000 men, as the beginning of the negotiations came closer the new figure was 850,000 men and a couple of months later, in November of 1973, the Western countries set this figure at 925,000 men. Thus in less than a year the Western estimate jumped by almost 200,000 men, and during the course of the negotiations--by another 50,000, although, as we know, the number of infantry troops of the socialist states remained the same.

The way the NATO countries inflated the actual number of armed forces of the states participating in the Warsaw Pact in Central Europe is alike in nature to the way they periodically proclaim that "the United States is behind in bomb-carrying aviation" or "behind in missiles" in the interests of increasing military expenditures.

All this leaves no doubt that the West is using the "figure discussion" of many years in order to camouflage its lack of desire to bring the matter to a concrete agreement.

The exchange of official data made in 1976 in Vienna by representatives of both sides showed that the overall number of armed forces of the NATO countries in Central Europe amounted to 981,000 men (including 791,000 infantry troops), and of the states of the Warsaw Pact--987,300 men (805,000 of them being infantry troops). The exchange made in the 21st round of the negotiations of updated figures concerning the number of troops directly participating in this region as of 1 January 1980 again confirmed that both sides have approximately the same number of armed forces personnel there. Moreover, with the completion of the withdrawal of 20,000 Soviet military servicemen from the GDR by 1 August 1980 the actual number of armed forces personnel of the socialist states in Central Europe decreased correspondingly. At the same time the number of troops of NATO states that directly participated in the negotiations, primarily the United States, increased.

In the specific conditions of the Central European region an effective reduction of the high concentration of troops and armaments can be achieved only under the condition that all participating states make an actually reciprocal and equal contribution to the reduction, that they reduce their armed forces and armaments within the time periods agreed upon and by amounts that are commensurate with their military potential in the given region. This is precisely what was envisioned by the developed draft of the agreement submitted by the USSR, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia on 8 November 1973--to reduce armed forces and armaments on a reciprocal basis, including nuclear arms by approximately 17 percent during 1971-1977. If the West had taken a constructive approach a large step would have been taken several years ago in the direction of reducing the military potentials in the center of our continent. The overall reduction would have amounted to about 300,000 military servicemen, thousands of tanks, hundreds of aircraft and a large quantity of other military equipment. Part of the immense burden of military preparations which the people have to bear would have been removed from their shoulders.

During the process of the negotiations the socialist states made significant efforts in the interest of bringing the positions closer together. They advanced a whole number of initiatives directed toward achieving a compromise, particularly the proposals of 8 June and 30 November 1968 and 28 June 1979. Taking the desires of the West into account, the socialist states declared their readiness to reduce only the number of infantry troops with a simultaneous establishment of an upper limit of the level of numbers of airforce personnel of both sides and to carry out a reciprocal reduction of troops and armaments in two stages so that in the first stage only the Soviet Union and the United States would reduce the number of troops, in proportion to their present numbers in this region. Then the reduction would have been carried out on a selective basis as the Western participants suggested. The socialist countries were in favor of arranging it so that equal collective levels of numbers of armed forces would be established as a result--900,000 men for each side, including 700,000 infantry troops.

At the same time the plan of the socialist states retained the key elements of their principle approach, including: the adoption by all direct participants in the negotiations of the corresponding commitments regarding the reduction of their troops and armaments in proportion to or commensurate to their military potential; and the

establishment of an effective mechanism for maintaining equal collective levels of the number of troops of both sides after the completion of the reductions which would apply to all participants.

The proposals advanced by the socialist states are based on principles of reciprocity and equality of contributions of both sides to the future reduction and limitation of troops and armaments in this region and the proper accounting for the legitimate interests of security of all states participating in the negotiations. In no stage of the Vienna negotiations did the socialist states demand that the NATO countries make contractual commitments which they themselves were not prepared to make.

Moreover the socialist countries are already making a significant contribution to military detente in Central Europe. The Soviet Union has implemented a decision made in October 1979 after consultation with its allies concerning unilateral removal of 20,000 military servicemen, 1,000 tanks and a considerable quantity of other military equipment from the GDR, that is directly from the region being discussed in Vienna, to its own territory.[4] As the updated figures showed, other socialist states have not increased the number of their armed forces.

As emphasized in the Warsaw Declaration of the PKK, the socialist states participating in the Vienna negotiations are prepared to continue in the future to exert efforts to find solutions which, without impairing the security of any one of the sides, would lead to a reduction of the level of military opposition in Central Europe. But such efforts are inadequate if they are one-sided.

Moreover the proposals from Western participants of 20 December 1975 to the socialist states made impossible demands regarding the volumes and the policy for reduction and the subsequent limitation of their troops. Moreover, while previously the direct Western participants agreed to include in the agreement for the first stage a commitment (if only of a general nature) to the effect that in the second stage they would reduce the number of their infantry troops by the volume necessary for achieving a collective ceiling of 700,000 men, their subsequent proposals did not envision contractual commitments concerning the reduction of troops belonging to six of the seven Western states that were participating directly in the negotiations. This change was brought about by a desire exempt from the troop reduction the FRG, Great Britain, Canada, Belgium, Holland and Luxumburg, which accounts for three-fourths of the contingent of NATO armed forces in Central Europe. But it is quite obvious that if these states do not make precise and clear legal commitments regarding the reduction of their troops, even if in the second stage, then the actual participation of the West in the reduction of the military potential will be nothing more than a fiction.

Previously the West European countries and Canada expressed their readiness to freeze the overall number of their troops in Central Europe as soon as an agreement could be reached concerning reducing the number of troops of the USSR and the United States in the first stage. But in keeping with the December document they no longer intend to take on any contractual commitment regarding freezing the number of their troops between the two stages of reduction. It turns out that the Soviet Union, which has approximately half of the overall number of troops of the countries of the Warsaw Pact in this region, was to have taken on contractual commitments to reduce and subsequently limit infantry troops in Central Europe while the West European countries, primarily such militarily powerful states as the FRG and Great Britain,

did not bind themselves to similar commitments and retained the possibility of increasing their armed forces in Central Europe.

The West also abandoned the positions it held previously with respect to such a key issue of the Vienna negotiations as the reduction and limitation of armaments and military equipment. At the end of 1975 the NATO countries agreed, as a "one-time measure," to reduce 1,000 American nuclear warheads and also 36 Pershing-1 launching installations and 54 F-4 aircraft carriers. This proposal is now being withdrawn.

Western propaganda is trying to justify such a step by referring to the fact that in December 1979 the U.S. government declared its intention to unilaterally remove from Europe 1,000 units of nuclear ammunition. But up to now nothing is known either about the quantity or about the types of nuclear ammunition that are to be removed directly from the region of Central Europe. Yet, according to estimates of a number of American military experts, the supplies of nuclear ammunition in Europe (according to official data, more than 7,000) greatly exceeds the needs of NATO and they could be reduced without detriment to the security of the countries of the West. Thus, for example, in the opinion of the former U.S. assistant defense minister, A. Enthoven, the North Atlantic block needs no more than 1,000 warheads for "containment." P. Warnke who in the recent past held the post of chief of the Agency for Disarmament and Arms Control pointed out that several hundred units of nuclear ammunition would suffice for the same purposes.[6]

Finally, the unilateral step of the United States can not be regarded separately from a simultaneous NATO decision concerning the production and development of about 600 new, more powerful medium-distance nuclear rockets on the territory on a number of West European states, including the region under discussion in the Vienna negotiations.

Refusing, in keeping with its December plan, to reduce arms and military equipment, the Western participants expressed consent only to refer in the agreement concerning the first stage the possibility of considering the issue of arms in the second stage of the negotiations. Yet it is clear that negotiations concerning reducing military opposition in the center of the European continent will not be effective if arms and other military equipment which comprise the main potential power of modern armed forces are not included within the framework of the future agreement.

In this connection one can not but agree with the following conclusion of the West German researcher, D. Senghaas: "Only an agreement which includes all components of the military machine and effectively precludes all possibilities of compensation or replacement can, taking into account the experience of past years, be considered to be an agreement in the area of control of arms that retards the dynamics of armament and leads to an effective curtailment of them."[7]

A reduction of armaments and military equipment is necessary in order to raise the first barrier on the path to an unrestrained arms race on the European continent. As for the socialist states, as was again confirmed at the conference of the PKK in Warsaw, there is no kind of armament which they would not be prepared to limit or curtail on a reciprocal basis.

As usual the NATO countries are not only against including in the reductions the air forces which are an extremely powerful and highly mobile form of armed forces, but they even refuse to establish an upper limit for the level of the air forces within the framework of general equal levels of numbers of armed forces of both sides. It is precisely this form of armed forces that is to perform the major function in the development of new American medium-distance nuclear missiles.

While insisting as usual on the establishment of national limitations for Soviet and American troops, the West at the same time is against the development of an effective mechanism for maintaining equal collective levels of troops which would regulate the number of troops of individual states without allowing them to increase in the future when the agreement concerning the second stage goes into force.

On the whole one can not avoid the conclusion that the December plan of the NATO states reflected a clear decrease in their interest in achieving in Vienna a general agreement which would satisfy both sides and would not impair anybody's security. The positions of the Western countries reflect more and more clearly the tendency to try, through various far-fetched proposals, to reduce the many years of efforts for developing this agreement to a reduction of only Soviet and American infantry troops in Central Europe. The volume of troop reduction which the troop reduction is prepared to make now is becoming less and less significant than it was in preceding "schemes." Instead it is suggested that the socialist states, in addition to a large reduction of USSR troops, accept an inflated package of "concomitant measures," and these measures are intended to apply to the daily activity of the armed forces of the socialist states not only in the region of Central Europe, but also far beyond its borders, including a significant part of the European territory of the USSR.

Thus the updated variant actually implies the notorious concept of control of armed forces and arms without disarmament--a concept, as we know, which amounts to a gathering of information and investigatory nature about the military potential of the Soviet Union.

Among the measures advanced by the West was preliminary notification of any troop movement outside the garrisons, beginning with the division formation. If one keeps in mind the considerably smaller number of personnel in the divisions of the states of the Warsaw Pact, it becomes clear that such a procedure would place the latter in a disadvantageous position in comparison to the NATO countries. They also suggested such steps as exchanging observations of military training, conducting periodic ground and air inspections, exchanging detailed military information about the number of personnel and the organizational structure of the troops, and creating permanent points where troops can enter and exit from the zone of reductions. The majority of these measures are not directly related to a reduction of armed forces and armaments, which runs counter to the decision agreed upon in the preliminary consultations.

As is clear from secret documents of the North Atlantic block published in the GDR press in May 1980, the NATO countries, by advancing in the Vienna negotiations a broad complex of measures that do not pertain to the reduction of arms and military equipment, are striving primarily to obtain information about the structure, armaments, equipment and military preparedness of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact states. Thus in one of the documents it is openly declared that as a whole these

measures are to assist NATO intelligence services with a global evaluation of the actions of the Warsaw Pact and its probable intentions, which would help to make the necessary decisions.[8] It is quite obvious that these proposals from the NATO countries can not be considered compromises. They not only do not contribute to progress in the negotiations but, on the contrary, create additional obstacles to the development of mutually acceptable agreements.

The evermore clearly revealed desire of the NATO countries to avoid the agreed-upon subject of the Vienna negotiations--the consideration of the key issues of reduction and limitation of troops and armaments--is not unexpected. Suffice it to recall the statement of the American senator, S. Nann, one of the main champions of increased military might for NATO in Europe. "I think," he said, "it has long been time to change the main focus of attention in the negotiations (in Vienna--G, Ye.) from a reduction of existing armed forces in Central Europe to the prevention of the sudden and unexpected use of them . . . . More specifically this means the creation of an all-embracing system of measures involved in reduction which are based on permanent and all-embracing verification in the locations in Europe. This would provide precise knowledge of any indications of military activity."

This is also the viewpoint held by L. Gelb, who occupied the post of director of the administration for military and political problems of the State Department. He also recommended that the agreement in the Vienna negotiations be reduced to a symbolic reduction of Soviet and American infantry troops by 20,000 and 10,000 men, respectively, and instead of taking, in his terms, "large steps" to agree on points for the entry and exit of troops into the Central zone, and prompt notification of large troop training sessions conducted outside the garrisons and the organization of inspection groups.[9] The West German general Steiff betrayed the same spirit when he was the senior military advisor of the FRG delegation in the Vienna negotiations for six years. He advises transferring the center of gravity of the negotiations to "concomitant measures, which have been applied to a sufficiently large region."[10]

The socialist states participating in the Vienna negotiations are attaching the appropriate significance to measures related to reductions, considering them as a means of providing for strict fulfillment of commitments made by all participants in the future agreement. The principle approach of the socialist states consists in the approach that the volume of these measures should correspond to the nature of practical steps for reducing troops and armaments, should be applied from the very beginning to the troops of all direct participants, and should embrace the entire region of Central Europe where the reductions take place.

If the NATO countries are really interested in spreading military detente to other regions of the country, say, in developing measures to promote trust regarding them, then these issues could be considered at the conference on questions of military detente and disarmament in Europe which have been proposed by the socialist states. In particular, the states of the Warsaw Pact have advanced an initiative concerning refraining from being the first to use both nuclear and regular arms against one another, and they have also suggested concrete measures for reducing military operation and strengthening trust, at the Warsaw Conference of the PKK in May 1980 and previously at the Berlin meeting of the committee of foreign affairs ministers of the states in December 1979.

An important prerequisite for concluding agreement concerning reduction of troops and armaments could be an agreement not to increase or to freeze the number of troops by both military and political alliances in Central Europe for the period of the negotiations. Such a measure, which the socialist states proposed as early as 1974, does not require any additional agreements or the development of conditions and procedures for reducing troops and armaments. At the same time its adoption would undoubtedly strengthen military stability in the center of Europe and would facilitate searches for other areas of agreement. Incidentally, many sober thinking representatives of Western countries agreed with this. In particular, the chairman of the senate committee on foreign affairs of the U.S. Congress, F. Church, noted: "For example, what convincing arguments can be made against the proposal to freeze the armed forces of the countries participating in the Vienna negotiations concerning the reduction of forces and armaments in Central Europe during the period when these negotiations are underway? None."

The West's current negative position concerning many of the high points of the Vienna problems is organically related to the overall line of the NATO countries toward changing the existing balance of military forces on the European continent in their favor and toward achieving military superiority over the soviet states. Such actions on Washington's part as the artificial postponement of the ratification of the SALT-II agreement, its decision to freeze disarmament negotiations in a number of areas and the immense increases of U.S. military expenditures do not contribute to the Vienna negotiations.

In the Pentagon program a very important place is allotted to military preparations in the Central European region. They plan not only to locate here a large part of the new medium-distance nuclear arms of the United States (the Pershing-2 and winged missiles), but also, by the end of 1982, to store supplies of arms and military equipment for three additional "double based" American divisions that are intended to be transferred to the European continent. Other measures are also being taken to increase the American military presence in Central Europe. During the period from 1966 through 1977 alone, that is in the course of the negotiations, the Pentagon sent an additional 26,000 servicemen to the FRG. So, on the one hand, the United States is conducting negotiations concerning the reduction of troops and armaments, and on the other, is carrying out military preparations in full force in that same region that is being discussed in Vienna.

In the autumn of 1980 on the territory of a number of Western European NATO countries, including those in the zone of the future agreement, there was a wave of military manouvers under the general code name of "Autumn Forge," with the participation of many tens of thousands of men, thousands of tanks, hundreds of aircraft and a large quantity of other military equipment. It goes without saying that the scale of these military measures conducted in the direct proximity of the socialist states as well as their direction run counter to the goals of the Vienna negotiations and the spirit of political and military detente.

One can not but be alarmed by the long-term plans for increasing the military might of the main component of the armed grouping of the North Atlantic block in Central Europe in terms of numbers and supplies of ordinary means of waging war--the West German Bundeswehr. According to data given in a speech by the FRG defense minister, H. Apel, of 7 March 1980, during the 1980's it is planned to fully re-equip the

Bundeswehr with the new generation of military equipment.[11] Extensive military preparations are being made in other NATO countries as well, including those which have troops in the region embraced by the Vienna negotiations. And these measures reveal with all clarity the true reasons why the West is stubbornly striving not to include armed forces and also armaments and military equipment of Western European countries and Canada within the framwork of the reductions.

Naturally the question of the participation of these countries in the freezing of the number of military personnel between the two stages and reducing their armed forces and armaments in the second stage is one of the key issues at the present time. Without a satisfactory solution to this problem it is impossible to ensure a balance of interests of the security of all participating states. One can not take effective steps in the area of military detente in Central Europe without including measures for reduction and limitation of troops and armaments of those states whose territories immediately form the area of reduction. The directly participating socialist states located here--the GDR, Poland and Czechslovakia--are prepared along with the reduction of Soviet and American troops and arms in the first stage to take on the corresponding contractual commitments concerning the reduction of their troops and armaments in the second stage and to freeze the number of their troops between the two stages. But they will do this, of course, on the basis of complete reciprocity under the condition that the direct Western European participants will take on similar commitments.

The governments of the Western states, mainly the United States, the FRG and Great Britain, have more than three-fourths of the total number of infantry and air force personnel of the NATO countries in Central Europe and they have a large responsibility for bringing the Vienna negotiations out of the blind alley into which they led it by their unrealistic intentions to obtain unilateral military advantages at the expense of the security of the socialist states.

The peaceful future of the European continent is being arranged today. It will depend to a considerable degree on the results of the negotiations in Vienna.

The Soviet Union and other socialist states, by following a principled course toward military detente in Central Europe, is contributing in all ways to the achievement of practical results in the Vienna negotiations. Following this course, the Soviet delegation, headed by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, L. I. Brezhnev, advanced a number of new ideas and proposals at the Moscow negotiations with leaders of the FRG in June 1980. They include concrete ideas about what should be done to develop agreements in Vienna so that the Vienna negotiations will proceed more actively and constructively.

On 10 July 1980 the Soviet Union and other socialist states participating directly made new suggestions that contribute to the development of an agreement for the first stage.[12] They envision a reduction of 13,000 Americans (that is, precisely the quantity that was indicated by the West itself at one time) and 20,000 Soviet military servicemen (along with the military contingent of 20,000 which the Soviet Union has already removed from the GDR). Moreover, the socialist countries have expressed their readiness to proceed toward the creation of a mechanism for maintaining collective levels of armed forces of NATO and of the Warsaw Pact in Central

Europe whereby the number of troops of each of the states directly participating would not exceed 50 percent of the equal collective level of 900,000 for each of the alliances.

In order to advance the negotiations and bring the positions of the two sides closer together, the Soviet delegation on 13 December 1980 made new proposals on behalf of the socialist countries directly participating in the negotiations--the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the USSR. If the West takes a constructive attitude toward the July initiative of the socialist countries, they have expressed their readiness, within the framework of the first agreement, to proceed toward a collective "freezing" of the number of troops of other direct participants in the negotiations, besides the USSR and the United States, for the period between the two stages of the reductions. This step has the nature of a compromise. It takes into account the position of the Western countries which are interested in refraining from establishing individual limitations on the number of troops of the direct participants. Thus a real possibility opens up for an accelerated solution to this problem.

The new initiatives of the soviet states are far-reaching in nature. They are dictated by the obvious desire to facilitate the search for mutually acceptable results. Now the Western participants must take an adequate step in response.

FOOTNOTES

1. Recall that the direct participants in the negotiations include states whose territories are part of the regions of the reductions and also states that have troops here. They include: the USSR, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia, on the side of the socialist countries; and the United STates, Great Britain, the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands, Canada and Luxemburg, on the Western side. Direct participants have the right to adopt decisions. The remaining participants in the negotiations whose territories lie beyond the region under discussion are Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and also Italy, Greece, Turkey, Denmark and Norway. They have a special status.

2. L. I. Brezhnev, "Leninskim kursom. Rechi i stat'i" ["A Leninist Course. Speeches and Articles"], Vol 6, Moscow, 1978, p 138.

3. See "Report of the Secretary of Defense H. Brown to the Congress on the Fiscal Year, 1981 Budget, January 29, 1980," Washington, 1980, p 112.

4. See PRAVDA, 1 August 1980.

5. See COEXISTENCE, Vol. 17, p 26.

6. See "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy Hearings," Washington, 1974, p 57.

7. BULLETIN FOR PEACE PROPOSALS, 1979, p 16.

8. See Document c-m (78) (NATO-secret); Document ac/276-d (79) 1 (NATO-secret).

9. See FOREIGN POLICY, Fall, 1979, p 25.

10. EUROPAISCHE WEHRKUNDE, No 1, 1980, p 6.

11. See BULLETIN DES PRESSE -- UND INFORMATIONSAMTES DER BUNDESREGIERUNG, 11 March 1980, p 215.

12. See PRAVDA, 11 July 1980.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1981

11772
CSO: 1807/76

INTENSIFICATION OF ECONOMIC CRISIS IN WEST EXPLAINED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 1, Jan-Feb 81 (signed to press 12 Jan 81) pp 31-40

[Article by Viktor Aronovich Cheprakov, Doctor of Economic Sciences, chief researcher of Institute of World Economics and International Relations of USSR Academy of Sciences: "Capitalism in a Period of Economic Upheavals"]

[Excerpts] An analysis of present-day international economic life permits the conclusion that a new cyclic crisis of overproduction has begun to appear in the capitalist world, with the general economic instability of the capitalist system especially intensified. Serious upheavals of the entire system of world capitalism and cyclic crises of a new type have come to replace the comparatively "prosperous" postwar thirty-year period of development of the capitalist economy, characterized by relatively brief and superficial recessions.

A certain animation in the economy which followed the 1973-1975 crisis proved to be very short-lived, as communists had foreseen.

As early as mid-1979, i.e., less than five years after the last crisis, signs of a curtailment in production began to appear, a drop in the volume of sales of manufactured goods began, and the amounts of new equipment orders decreased.

The United States and England were first to be affected by the crisis.

Crisis waves from these two countries, which account for 44 percent of all industrial production in the capitalist world, also are spreading to other states, increasing the negative effect of their internal difficulties. This fully concerns the FRG, where the economic growth rates are dropping to one percent annually by late 1980. Development of the Japanese economy has slowed threefold, which means that the country is entering a period of serious upheavals. There was a drop in the increase in manufactured products in France. Crisis phenomena also are seen in other capitalist countries.

The present-day reality fully confirms the general causes of a cyclic development of the capitalist economy identified by Marxist theory, the culmination of which is a crisis of overproduction. The effect of this law leads to an aggravation of the insoluble contradiction between capital's aspiration for unlimited expansion of production for the sake of obtaining maximum profits and the limited consumption of the masses.

Cyclic crises are an inalienable feature of the capitalist method of production, with each crisis having its own features and developing in a specific historical setting. Each crisis is linked with specific political factors affecting its depth, duration, devastating force, and economic and social consequences.

The 1973-1975 crisis and the crisis which now has begun to develop have a number of features which allow them to be viewed as a new type of crisis situation. These features include a shortening of the period of cycles from 10-12 years in prewar years and in the first two postwar decades to five years in our time.

The 1973-1975 crisis and the present crisis greatly surpass previous ones in the depth of the drop in industrial production. It is expected that the crisis which has set in will leave the 1973-1975 crisis behind in its depth. This is explained by the circumstance that when the stagnation began in the economy of capitalist countries, the companies began to cut back the volume of commodity stocks, which greatly rose in the period of an upswing which assumed the character of an artificially created boom. In addition, the present crisis was caused by a reduction in the population's effective demand.

The adventuristic policy of the United States and its allies, aimed at undermining detente and creating zones of military tension in the Near and Middle East, the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia and Latin America, give the crisis a particularly devastating character. This very policy sets up appreciable obstacles to emerging from the crisis. Implementation of a decision to station medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe also understandably is not creating conditions for an upswing in the economy in this region.

Although capitalist countries are not entering the crisis strictly simultaneously, the 1973-1975 and the present crisis on the whole have a certain synchronous nature, which also increases the extent of their depth and duration to no small amount.

The fact that an improvement in business conditions occurs unevenly by countries and that phases of animation and upswing are interrupted by recessions should be included among the features of the present cycle. Thus even in a stage of advance, many leading sectors are undergoing stagnation and even a drop in production. It is also noteworthy that phenomena characteristic of the most acute stages of a crisis--mass unemployment, sluggishness of investments, lack of stability in production and exchange, and an intensive tightening of the inflationary spiral--continue to be observed in the intercrisis period.

As established by Marxist economic science, every crisis is linked with a reorganization of the structure of capital. The crisis results in a depreciation of a portion of the capital of bankrupt enterprises and a drop in wages, which provides a certain increase in the average rate of profit. All this leads to a temporary forced establishment of equilibrium between production and consumption, which provides for the creation of preconditions for a new upswing.

The economic instability characteristic of the 1960's and 1970's was replaced by the growing worsening of the entire system of capitalism. These manifestations of the depth of upheaval are a natural consequence of the fact that collectivization of productive forces is occurring in the envelope of private ownership which has historically outlived itself and is doomed.

The world system of capitalist economy which finally formed under imperialism creates an opportunity for industrially developed countries to shift a considerable portion of their own economic adversities onto developing states. Industrially developed countries are enslaving the young liberated states financially more and more by collecting excessively high interest on loans, expanding exports to developing countries, thus undermining national industry, and taking out raw materials at low monopoly prices. Suffice it to say that their debt to Western countries is approaching $400 billion in all kinds of credit.[7]

Imperialism naturally is now encountering a constantly growing resistance on the part of developing countries, which are striving to establish economic independence and exercise the inalienable right to dispose of national natural resources themselves. They advocate a realignment of international economic relations on the basis of equality, which precludes any forms of discrimination.

The developing countries' positions largely are being strengthened because some of the young states have torn themselves from the orbit of imperialist exploitation. Some of them have come under the banners of Leninism and are accomplishing profound social transformations, while others have taken a noncapitalist path of development.

The upheavals of capitalism's economic system have been caused to a decisive extent by the processes occurring within the system itself. The formation of a highly developed state-monopoly economy was a consequence of the high level of monopolization and the increased intervention of the bourgeois states in the economic life.[8]

But the powerful monopolistic associations, which have undermined the market's spontaneity ("free enterprise" now is a lie to lull the naive), which dominate the market and know its volume and demands, cannot arrive at a planned basis or hinder the sharp business fluctuations. It is this high degree of monopolization, under which major corporations have an opportunity to set prices arbitrarily based on their own selfish interests, which is leading to a disorganization of economic life.

Having a rather broad arsenal of regulatory means, state intervention in the economy potentially is capable of curbing the undermining actions of the monopolies at least to a certain extent. But inasmuch as state policy in regulating the economy with the help of budgets and taxes, like its foreign economy activity, is directed at ensuring the interests of the state-monopoly oligarchy to the detriment of broad masses of the population, it is the source of economic upheaval itself.

The economic development of capitalism, the ever-growing concentration and centralization of capital and production, ineffectiveness of state regulation in every individual capitalist country, and the desire to counter the challenge of the world socialist system in particular generated a tendency toward development of state-monopoly capitalism primarily existing within a national framework into interstate-monopoly capitalism. This cosmopolitanization of the capitalist economy is proceeding primarily along two interrelated channels.

First of all, there is a further concentration of capital and production at the level of the world capitalist economy. Major U.S. monopolies have become transnational monopolies, while West European monopolies have become multinational.

These companies produce a significant portion of their goods abroad, where they create their own "domestic market."[9] Lately there has been evidence even of a division of the production of primary enterprises, a portion of which is taken out of a national framework.

Secondly, a cosmopolitanization of capital and production also is being accomplished in the course of agreements and direct participation in the world economy by bourgeois states from among the developed capitalist countries, with the cosmopolitanization occurring both on a regional and an overall imperialist scale. In both instances, the state contributes to the penetration of transnational capital into other countries. It also takes part in international-capitalistic alliances, associations, and institutes.

The development of interstate-monopoly forms is a characteristic phenomenon of present-day capitalism. Transnational monopolies and interstate agreements comprise the leading forms. At the same time, the exchange of commodities--the first sector of the economy in the history of capitalism from which its international ties began--has developed into a comprehensive world capitalist trade. Changes have occurred in the very structure of exchange along with an increase in the scale of economic exchange under the aegis of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).[10]

A new form of banks--transnational banking concerns--has taken shape.

It should be noted in particular that military industry has expanded to general imperialistic scope by conclusion of agreements on standardization and unification of weapon models and systems. A general national system of the military-industrial complex is taking shape throughout the capitalist world.

The "personal union" of monopolies with governments, to which V. I. Lenin attached such great importance for study, now is embodied in similar alliances of transnational monopoly representatives with governments, in the appearance and expansion of a general imperialist management, in development of a layer of international bureaucrats in the EEC ("Eurocrats"), and in a strengthening of the general imperialist state-monopoly oligarchy. The diversity of state-monopoly forms and multitude of variants of their combinations reinforces the process of cosmopolitanization as a whole.

Another very important feature of present-day capitalism is the coordination of political actions by representatives of higher echelons of authority on an interstate scale for influencing the course of economic processes.[11] The processes now occurring, during which state-monopoly capital breaks out of the national envelope, understandably does not eliminate the capitalist forms of exploitation but, as Lenin pointed out in his time, merely reinforced the discrepancy between the level of collectivization and the system of capitalist relationships.

Imperialism is riddled with internal contradictions at the interstate-monopoly level. The dialectics of its development is such that an internationalization of the capitalist world's economic relationships objectively leads to separation, dissociation, and an aggravation of the opposition of imperialist countries and groupings.

This is why interstate-monopoly methods of regulating the economy, which have become part of the mechanism designed to ensure the functioning of the capitalist economy, are in no condition to prevent economic upheavals and crises. Along with the intensifying contradictions in the coordination of individual countries' economic policy, monopoly competition makes any kind of effective regulation impossible. But it is this contradictory uniformity within the state-monopoly capitalism which gives economic upheavals and crises a global character and, by virtue of this, great acuteness as well.

Under capitalism the scientific-technological revolution acts as one of the factors leading to an aggravation of social-economic problems.

One of the most important features of present-day monopoly capitalism is linked with a sharply increased discrepancy between an acceleration in the accumulation of capital and the level of demands by broad toiling masses. A characteristic feature of the accumulation process under conditions of state-monopoly capitalism is that major monopolies are increasing the mass of their profit with state help and even are achieving an increase in its norm. First of all, state enterprises are passing on a portion of the surplus value they receive to the private-monopoly sector either as a result of purchasing goods from private monopolies at inflated prices or by establishing preferential tariffs for them (on electrical energy, transport services and so on). Secondly, the state provides monopolies with direct material and financial support through subsidies and various kinds of credits, and by granting them certain tax preferences. Thirdly, the state nationalizes or supports those sectors needed for normal functioning of the economic mechanism of a capitalist economy, but which do not provide the usual profit norm.

The effect of all these factors led to a considerable overaccumulation of capital, as reflected in the chronic underuse of production capacities, slowing of investment growth rate, and an increase in the amount of capital export to countries with a medium level of economic development and to more backward states. An overaccumulation of capital leads to a slowing of economic growth, hinders a solution to the crisis of overproduction, and retards or even lowers an increase in consumption.

Relationships of imperialist countries with developing states belonging to the world system of capitalist economy represent a serious, permanent factor undermining the capitalist economy. State-monopoly capitalism just was not able to create a new system of economic relationships to replace the colonial system, where industrial countries developed on cheap and abundant fuel and raw materials during its existence. The economically unequal relations, a correlation of prices on raw materials and manufactured goods unprofitable for developing countries, and their enormous debt to international banks and financial corporations (comprising some $350 billion) all represent a source of intensifying, insoluble contradictions.

The present level of internationalization of production and capital not only does not solve the acute problems which capitalism has encountered, but more and more aggravates them inasmuch as cosmopolitanization of the economy serves primarily the interests of the state-monopoly oligarchy. Moreover, tendencies for state-monopoly capitalism to develop into interstate-monopoly capitalism spawn new forms of rivalry--competition between transnational monopolies and national capital becomes

fiercer, the struggle of transnational corporations among themselves becomes more acute, and there is an intensification of the divergence of general imperialist and nationally isolated, local interests.

Meanwhile, it does not at all follow from the fact that the world capitalistic economy is taking on new forms that all countries are involved in it to a like degree and occupy an equal position within it.

The system of interstate-monopoly capitalism taking shape creates no opportunities for economic development of each individual country. Agreements among imperialist powers constantly are being undermined by fierce competitive bouts which undermine the very bulwarks of the western world. There is an insoluble contradiction between the objective historic necessity for further internationalization of production and the consequences of this internationalization for participating countries.

The present stage of imperialism thus is characterized by the antagonistic unity of state-monopoly capital of various countries in the world capitalist economy. The rivalry between the United States and Western Europe is growing under the presently existing conditions of economic upheavals.

The desire of the United States to establish its hegemony in the capitalist world to the detriment of other countries is becoming more and more apparent. The trend toward a reduction in the U.S. share of industrial production and foreign trade of the capitalist world, its loss of priority in the area of scientific research and development, an intensification of competition which foreign suppliers are presenting to American firms, and the general weakening of U.S. economic and political positions in the world merely intensify its expansionistic aspirations.

The tempos and scope of American economic expansion are growing.

The revival of a unique economic nationalism in Western Europe, reflected in the striving to defend national economic interests and, especially typical, in the attempt to strengthen the Common Market's positions, is a reaction to U.S. pretensions.

Japan also is taking part in the inter-imperialistic struggle along with the United States and the EEC. Japanese supertrusts are playing a more and more prominent role in the arrangement of economic forces. Japan's ruling circles are trying to overcome certain weaknesses in their economy through foreign economic expansion, penetrating domestic markets of the United States and Western Europe and increasing the export of capital to Southeast Asian countries. This generates irreconcilable contradictions between Japan and its imperialist partner-rivals.

A growth of neoprotectionism, increasing strictness of various forms of import restrictions such as the introduction of import quotas and import licensing, an increase in customs duties, and establishment of direct and indirect customs barriers are still another manifestation of contradictions in the world capitalist system. A trade war will have very negative consequences for the capitalist economy and will hinder its emergence from a crisis condition.

Under conditions of the unfolding economic crisis and general chronic economic upheavals there are growing differences within the Common Market, where, in the presence of common interests, one simultaneously observes phenomena both of integration and disintegration. The forced commonality is the result of a desire to use the mechanism of supranational agencies of the Community for strengthening the positions of ruling classes of Western European countries, to counter the offensive by American and Japanese monopoly capital, to achieve success in conquering new spheres of economic and political influence in "Third World" states, and exert effective pressure on western countries which are not in the EEC. Meanwhile, there are ineradicable contradictions within the Common Market, which unite states with a stronger economy (the FRG) with countries having a weakened economy (England, Italy, France). This is one of the ways the Leninist law of uneven development under imperialism is manifested under present-day conditions.

It is typical of recent times that governmental policy, the role and importance of which for the economy have grown immeasurably, is distinguished by a noticeable lack of consistency. First steps are taken to animate an economy in stagnation, to stimulate it through the budget, investments and tax preferences, or increase state purchases of commodities and services (the "reflation policy"), then a "deflation policy" is followed, aimed at checking economic growth through limitations in the money-credit and financial areas or a sharp increase in discount rates. In the first instance a forcing of economic growth generates a new spiral of inflation and in the second, restraint on economic activity reinforces the recession. A vicious circle ensues: An attempt is made to heal inflation by recession, and recession by inflation.

The disruption of the economic mechanism involves a profound distortion of the proportions of capitalist reproduction, which in turn strengthens the crisis situation even more.

Sectorial crises and lengthy recessions have become a permanent phenomenon in economics, particularly in its leading sectors--the steel-casting industry, shipbuilding, civil construction, the automobile industry and the coal industry.

The constant currency crisis attests to the disorder of capitalism's international economic relations. The abrupt jumps in rates of exchange make the capitalist economy feverish. Weakness of the dollar, the basic payment-reserve currency of the capitalist world, the drop in its exchange rate, and an increase in the market price of gold of almost twenty times over the last ten years reinforce the crisis of the West's currency and financial system as a whole.

A trend toward a reduction in growth rates of the world capitalist trade volume has been established. In 1976, for example, it increased 15 percent, while in 1979 it increased only by 5 percent.

An insufficient level of production capital investment and even an investment stagnation have become an ordinary phenomenon. The blame for this lies primarily with the transnational corporations, which hold back capital investments in countries of origin. This leads to technological backwardness and an increase in production costs, and it creates a surplus of production capacity in a number of sectors. The situation is aggravated by a practice, which has become widespread of

late, of exporting capital to countries with a cheap and unorganized labor force and situated, moreover, nearer sources of raw materials (South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong), where imperialism considers its position firm.

The threat of a devastating thermonuclear war and war hysteria stemming from aggressive circles also is creating an unfavorable climate for investments in peacetime sectors of the economy.

Constantly growing inflation is clear and persuasive evidence of the deep disorder in contemporary capitalism's economic mechanism.

Inflation primarily is a result of monopolistically high prices set by capitalist corporations; enormous military expenditures leading to an increase in state budget deficits and covered by an unlimited emission of paper moneys; and the influx of American capital into Western European countries. An increase in oil prices undoubtedly has a certain effect on the West's economy, but it is just as unquestionable that inflation rates rose even long before the oil crisis. In other words, the growth in oil prices followed inflation (which was exported, by the way, to the oil producing countries), and did not cause it. A very considerable share of blame for the rise in oil prices rests with the oil monopolies of capitalist countries.

As already stated, the American imperial geopolitics is the primary cause of inflation. The maintenance of military bases and a striving for military presence in a majority of world regions leads to an enormous growth in the U.S. balance of payments deficit. As a result, other countries accumulate enormous dollar assets and they actually have to finance this deficit both because of direct U.S. coercion and out of the fear that otherwise the entire financial system of the capitalist world might collapse.

The situation which has shaped up recently is leading to a further growth of inflation. It is expected that in the period 1980-1985 the inflation level will reach 26-30 percent, while in 1985-1990 it will soar to 45-50 percent.

The consequences of such an inflation growth threaten the paralysis of financial markets and loss of incentives for accumulating capital and for economic growth. Hard times are ahead for the dollar. It is becoming more and more unacceptable as reserve currency. Western countries will strive to reduce the proportion of dollar assets in their currency reserves, and there will be a continuing increase in gold prices.

The roots of future social disturbances and political upheavals lie in the development of inflation, which lowers the workers' standard of living, and in the unrestrained growth in prices.

Unemployment is one of the most acute problems of capitalism. Its mass and chronic character in itself is sufficient for indicting the capitalist system. While unemployment in the past rose considerably primarily during crisis periods, now the fluctuations in its level practically have no relationship to a cyclic phase. That is to say, the crisis increases unemployment, but unemployment does not drop after the crisis.

The future promises a further growth of unemployment generated by capitalist rationalization of production and by a general unfavorable condition of the economic mechanism. The nonproduction sphere, which in the past absorbed part of the labor force and a certain portion of the unemployed, now ceases to be a supplementary reservoir for absorbing the excess ablebodied populace as a result of the concentration of enterprises in the sphere of services and an acceleration of the growth of labor productivity therein.

Only the working class is offering real resistance to the crisis and to a worsening of the general economic situation. By acting against the strategy of monopoly capital and the bourgeois state aimed at restraining wages, increasing labor intensification and reducing the people's standard of living, and defending guaranteed employment, workers and trade unions to some extent are blocking a drop in the overall purchasing power and thus are contributing to the preservation of effective demand. The struggle against the economy's militarization weakens the effect of crisis factors in exactly the same way.

***

The capitalist economy is entering the 1980's burdened by growing disproportions and contradictions and with an archaic organizational structure of the economic mechanism which no longer corresponds to the present-day level of productive forces and demands of scientific-technological progress. This is occurring under new historic conditions where a new system of values and social priorities is undergoing a process of development, a process determined primarily by an increase in the size and social role of the working class, which perceives ever more clearly that only profound changes in the social-economic relationships and society's political organization are capable of ensuring progressive economic development and real social progress.

FOOTNOTES

7. "Statistical Abstract of the United States," Washington, 1980.

8. There has been a sharp increase in states' intervention in the economy in postwar years. The proportion of state expenditures in gross national products of member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development rose from an average of 28 percent in the mid-1950's to 34 percent in the mid-1960's and to 41 percent in the mid-1970's.

9. The proportion of standard net output of transnational and multinational corporations in the total production volume of the capitalist world rose from 16 percent in 1960 to 21.8 percent in 1975 (MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 8, 1978, p 117). Inasmuch as direct investments of transnational corporations now are rising 2-3 times faster than the gross national products of a majority of states, there is every basis to assume that by the mid-1980's 70-75 percent of the industrial production of the capitalist world will lie with 300 of the largest of them.

10. Approximately one-third of the foreign trade turnover of developed capitalist countries is related to the ties among production affiliates of transnational monopolies.

11. Within a regional framework this is the European Parliament of Common Market member countries and the EEC Commission, and on a general imperialist scale it is the annual conferences of heads of state and governments of the seven leading capitalist countries (United States, Japan, FRG, France, England, Italy and Canada).

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1981

6904
CSO: 1807

CONFERENCE ON DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST IDEAS IN THIRD WORLD

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 1, Jan-Feb 81 (signed to press 12 Jan 81) pp 158-163

[Article by A. N. Berkan' and V. V. Prozorovskiy: "Scientific Life: Ideas of Socialism in Liberated Countries"]

[Text] In late November 1980 a theoretical conference entitled "Marxism-Leninism and the Struggle of Ideas on Questions of Socialism in Developing Countries" was held in Moscow, organized by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU CC and the Scientific Council on Problems of Foreign Ideological Trends of the USSR AN [Academy of Sciences].

In his introductory remarks, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences M. P. Mchedlov, deputy director of the IML [Institute of Marxism-Leninism] under the CPSU CC, noted that the Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialism, embodied in actual social practice, is exerting a great positive influence on ideological opposition in developing countries by virtue of its example. Meanwhile, it must be considered that in a majority of liberated countries the proletariat is very small and in a number of instances insufficiently organized. The influence of backward tradition, religion and nationalism is felt strongly there. There is also the effect of bourgeois anticommunist propaganda and Peking's concepts, particularly the so-called theory of "three worlds." Different varieties of the concept of "democratic socialism" also have some influence.

Nevertheless, socialist slogans now are proclaimed officially in several dozen liberated countries with a total population of more than one billion persons.

This all determines the great political and scientific interest in a study of the concepts of socialism in countries of Asia and Africa. Today it is important to study the prospects for the anti-imperialist movement and problems of the influence of ideas of scientific socialism and their actual embodiment on the development of mass awareness in developing countries, based on methodological theses of the tactics of Marxism-Leninism. Criticism of anticommunism and anti-sovietism acquires special importance. The overcoming of archaic traditions and reactionary nationalism, which hinders a unity of the forces of socialism and national liberation, also is of great importance.

Academician M. B. Mitin (USSR AN Scientific Council on Problems of Foreign Ideological Trends) gave a report entitled "Selected Problems of Ideological Struggle on Problems of Socialism in Developing Countries." He emphasized that previously oppressed nations which "existed for the capitalist culture and civilization only as material for fertilizer" now have become a subject of history. A broad spectrum of anti-imperialist forces determines the diversity in content and forms of the revolutionary liberation struggle by nations of developing states. The uniqueness of young states is determined by different political structures and correlation of class forces diverse in the character of development tasks, and by different approaches to a solution to fundamental problems. But today there is a struggle over ways for further development of these states at the basis of ideological processes in these parts of the world. In response to successes in the further coordination of the national liberation movement with forces of peace, progress and socialism and with the communist and working movement, international imperialism is directing major efforts in the struggle against national liberation movements, including in ideological struggle, at splitting socialism and the forces of national liberation and undermining socialism's authority among nonaligned states.

Related concepts developed in the West concerning "interdependence" of industrially developed and developing states and the "modernization" and "westernization" of young nations are designed to perpetuate for a long while the unequal position of liberated countries. Meanwhile a strengthening of the developing states' positions and an increase in their influence in the world arena force monopolistic circles to maneuver, to agree to concessions in some issues, and to seek an alliance with reactionary bourgeois, feudal-landowning and politically vacillating petty-bourgeois groupings in the young states.

The communist parties make up the most consistent, progressive political force in the struggle against imperialist and petty bourgeoisie and the feudal-landowning ideology, and against the right-reformist and leftist-sectarian trends. This force is introducing scientific Marxist-Leninist ideology to the public awareness. Revolutionary-democratic parties in power in countries of a socialist orientation also perform an active role in introducing elements of scientific socialism to the ideological life of the masses of people.

Along with this, numerous theories of bourgeois "socialism" are in wide use in the developing states. The purpose of these theories is to camouflage the bourgeois political course and a policy of encouraging capitalist relationships ("Asiatic," "African," "Arab," "Islamic" socialism and so on). Nationalism is the soil from which the seeds of bourgeois "socialism" sprout.

Bourgeois "socialism" also is undergoing an evolution with the development and deepening of political struggle in the liberated countries. It is becoming more flexible and frequently steps up the pseudonationalistic, "democratic" phraseology in an attempt to adapt to social changes in the world.

But time is working on the side of Leninism. As L. I. Brezhnev stressed, "the attractive force of socialism is growing stronger and developing among the masses of many millions of people in countries which have thrown off the yoke of colonial dependence. In search for ways to overcome age-old backwardness, they are reaching

out toward the light of socialism and some of these countries already have taken the path of noncapitalist development."[1]

The presentation by Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Yu. Kolpinskiy (IML under the CPSU CC) was devoted to an analysis of the views of the founders of scientific communism on the question of petty-bourgeois socialism. He said that social practice refuted the bourgeois ideologists' falsifications by proving that on an overall scale petty-bourgeois socialism had demonstrated its historic limitations. At the same time in real life many of its theses continue to exert sufficiently strong influence, including on the working and national liberation movement of our days. In this connection an examination of what it represents, what are the criteria of its assessment and what are the forms of petty-bourgeois socialism is of scientific interest and is politically urgent. The works of Marx and Engels and a study of the history of their struggle against various kinds of petty-bourgeois-socialist theories are very useful in resolving these problems. Marx and Engels traced the development of petty-bourgeois socialism both as an ideology and as a social movement. They defined the utopian and reactionary trends in it. At the same time they also saw certain positive points in this direction of social thought and clearly distinguished the activity by creators of panaceas and the movement's ideologists from the awareness and the movement of the workers themselves.

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Ye. S. Troitskiy (IML under the CPSU CC) covered certain questions on the use of Marxist-Leninist methodology for analyzing socialist trends in liberated countries. He named among the most important methodological principles basic to an analysis of the concepts of nonproletarian socialism in Asia and Africa a consideration of the character of the present era and application of basic, fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism on the material basis for the appearance and development of social ideas and on social-economic formations. An analysis of transitional economic relations which have formed in a number of countries, and in countries with a socialist orientation above all, acquires serious importance under present-day conditions. An important role is played in this respect by a study of the nature of different social-economic structures and their interaction, since non-Marxist socialist ideas reflect a specific form of economic interest of specific class forces connected with particular structures for occupying an intermediate position.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and class struggle is one of the principles for a scientific analysis of the origin, substance and forms of socialist trends in developing countries. In particular, certain concepts of modern nonproletarian socialism in a number of aspects represent a revival of unique populist ideas under completely different historic conditions of the era of transition from capitalism to socialism. In this respect the Leninist methodology of a comprehensive class analysis of populism serves as the key to a proper assessment of many aspects of a number of theories of non-Marxist socialism which have arisen in young states. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on the nationalist liberation movement is an important theoretical prop for an analysis of different socialist trends present in Asian and African countries. In contrast to the utopian socialism of

1. L. I. Brezhnev. "Leninskim kursom: rechi i stat'i" [With a Leninist Course: Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1970, II, 59.

past centuries, the present-day nonproletarian concepts of socialism largely reflect a struggle not only against local exploiters, but above all against foreign imperialist oppression. Acute social-economic antagonisms propelled by national liberation revolutions are manifested in particular in the ideological sphere, leading to the appearance of the most diverse social doctrines, including many non-Marxist socialist trends.

A requisite demand of an analysis of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois social-economic theories is their comparison with practical politics. It is no secret that many of these concepts are characterized by a separation of word and deed and a certain discrepancy between the formal and meaningful aspects of the doctrines of nonproletarian socialism. In this respect their analysis should be conducted at two levels simultaneously: first of all, an examination of program documents and works of particular ideologists and, secondly, revelation of the degree of their conformity to social-economic transformations and reforms.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialist society acquires great importance for an analysis of contemporary concepts of nonproletarian socialism. Different provisions of this teaching and the actual practice of its embodiment serve as a criterion for assessing particular aspects of non-Marxist socialist trends. The general principles of the building of socialism acting in concrete, specific forms thus play a special role in this respect.

Observance of the Marxist principle of irreconcilability of the socialist and bourgeois ideologies is a necessary condition for a scientific, party approach to examining the concepts of nonproletarian socialism. While supporting everything valuable in the concepts of non-Marxist socialism, acting for a unity of the broadest layers of society in the anti-imperialist struggle, and attempting to accelerate the ideological evolution of the leading part of nonproletarian revolutionaries toward perception of the provisions of scientific socialism, communists at the same time are making no ideological compromises at all, nor are they allowing a dissolution of the ideas of scientific socialism in amorphic theoretical constructions.

In recent years social democratic parties have been strenuously seeking new ways and methods for reinforcing their influence in developing states. These searches are linked directly with the present stage in the general crisis of capitalism and with the policy of imperialism with respect to nations of former colonies and semicolonies, as formulated theoretically in the doctrines of neocolonialism.

As emphasized by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. D. Granov (Scientific Council for Problems of Foreign Ideological Trends of the USSR AN), attempts of this sort also are connected with an attempt by the leadership of the Socialist International to expand the international political base of social democracy and reinforce its position in liberated countries. A wave of national liberation revolutions during and after World War II forced monopoly capital to hasten to develop a neocolonialist course and formulate it ideologically. Right social democracy in turn hastened to the assistance of big capital, whose positions in developing countries were faced with an unprecedented threat.

But right social democracy does not have any solid support in Asia, Africa or Latin America. By the time World War II ended there was practically not one major party of a social democratic type in existence on these continents, despite the presence of an evironment potentially favorable for an ideology of social reformism.

Reasons for the defeat of social democracy in liberated countries should be sought primarily in the fact that, in the eyes of the public of these countries, social democracy had compromised itself by subservience to imperialism. Together with the bourgeois home country, it tried to stifle the national liberation movement with an armed hand during the colonial war in Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia, Algeria and other countries.

In the 1960's the Socialist International realized that the policy of blind anticommunism and frenzied antisovietism had turned against its instigators. The present social democratic course with respect to developing states has the purpose of reconciling the nations of young states with neocolonialism. The present world situation is such that social democratic figures are forced to dissociate themselves from a number of aspects of imperialist policy.

Meanwhile, social democratic leaders are supporting and participating in the elaboration of imperialist plans for a "world economic order," which sets the task of preserving and deepening the dependence of young states on the chief centers of world imperialism. They are vigorously contributing to the practical realization of these plans. "Democratic socialism," which provides for preservation of the foundations of the bourgeois order of things for an unspecified long period of time is the prospect presented by social democratic parties for the young states.

After failing to create openly prowestern social democratic parties in a majority of young states, the leadership of the Socialist International now is placing main reliance on strengthening contacts and on organizational and ideological rapprochement with petty-bourgeois and even bourgeois reformist parties in developing countries. In certain instances this tactic produced definite results (Senegal, Turkey, Venezuela). As the national liberation movement enters a new phase--a phase of struggle for fundamental social transformations--and as class contradictions polarize within developing states and social forces acting for orientation of their countries' movement along a path of scientific socialism grow, trends toward a rapprochement with western social democracy become more active with the right wing of national reformism. But these trends are precarious and devoid of true historic perspective.

As pointed out by Doctor of Historical Sciences L. R. Polonskaya (USSR AN Oriental Studies Institute), the concepts of "Islamic socialism" represent one of the variants of "national socialisms" which became relatively widespread in Afro-Asian countries in the 1960's and 1970's. They are used for the political mobilization of masses both by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists and naturally differ in their social and political directions.

The coexistence of different levels of social awareness is reflected in the concepts of "Islamic socialism," as in the entire ideology of a "third path" of development, one of the directions of which includes these concepts. Such coexistence is conditioned primarily by the unevenness of capitalism's development.

On the whole the ideas of "Islamic socialism" reflect a dialectical connection of the anti-imperialist, democratic and, in a number of instances, even an anti-capitalist trend on the one hand and an anticommunist, reactionary trend on the other.

This is reflected in a varying interpretation of the fundamental ideas of "Islamic economics" (the principle of "labor ownership"; a combination of three kinds of ownership: private, state and cooperative; a shift of wage-leveling principles into the sphere of distribution: leveling with the help of a tax in favor of the poor; a ban on usurious interest rates; combination of the nationalization of major sectors of the industry with development and decentralization of small-scale industry, and so on) and the power structure (a combination of principles of sovereignty of the people with an authoritarian form of government and a leader's charisma).

Up to the end of the 1970's ideas of the "Islamic third path" primarily took the form of "Islamic socialism," while at the beginning of the 1980's it took the form of different concepts of a "renewal of faith." The basic principles of the "Islamic third path" not only are being developed, but also introduced into the state structure of some countries. Of greatest interest here are the Iranian models of "Tawhid economics" and the "Islamic state."

Polonskaya noted in conclusion that the overcoming of traditional prejudice of believers with respect to scientific socialism is possible only with the development of revolutionary-democratic trends of the petty-bourgeois nationalist ideology. The shift of broad popular Moslem masses to revolutionary-democratic positions inevitably signifies a gradual withdrawal from ideas of "Islamic socialism." But this complex task of a gradual change in traditional awareness requires a lengthy time for its resolution.

Doctor of Historical Sciences V. V. Bogoslovskiy (USSR AN Africa Institute) emphasized that in its political and ideological essence the theory of "rich" and "poor" nations propagandized by ideologists of imperialism and Peking's hegemonists is extremely reactionary. It is aimed at undermining the international alliance of the forces of world socialism and the international working and national liberation movements, and against a strengthening of peace and development of truly friendly, equitable relations among peoples. The theory of "rich" and "poor" nations serves the monopolistic bourgeoisie of the West as a cloak under which it fights socialism and attempts at the same time to shift responsibility from itself for the backwardness of developing countries.

Exploiting circles of developing countries use this same theory in their own interests in an attempt to shift to all "white, rich nations" the blame for poverty and backwardness of millions of their countries' workers. The local bourgeoisie views this theory as a political lightning rod designed to turn the growing revolutionary class struggle for profound social-economic transformations in developing countries into an evolutionary-reformist channel and to reduce the matter of realigning international economic relationships to a "summit" deal by foreign and local exploiters.

At the same time an entire complex of factors of an objective nature--the backwardness and poverty of a considerable portion of the populace--and a subjective nature--survivability of nationalistic prejudices, illiteracy of the population, and so on--led to the very wide spread of the theory of "rich" and "poor" nations in developing countries, which has a negative influence on all sociopolitical trends of nonproletarian socialism.

This theory was completely accepted in the ideological inventory by bourgeois national reformism, which often comes out with slogans of all kinds of "national socialisms." Representatives of this ideological-political trend draw the chief watershed in the world not between two social-economic systems but between the industrially developed states and the developing countries. They automatically include the Soviet Union in the group of industrial nations. This is why some of the bourgeois figures of this direction are characterized by antisovietism, acting as a certain tribute to imperialism and Peking's social chauvinism and as a display of class hatred for the socialist system.

At the same time, continued the speaker, national reformists of a number of countries are criticizing the imperialist powers, but this criticism does not go beyond the bounds of demands for an "equalization of chances" in the competitive struggle and a redistribution of profits from the exploitation and sale of national riches.

Some representatives of revolutionary democracy most often display a nonclass approach in the sphere of international relations, which by their nature represent an extremely complex and many-sided phenomenon. Common to them is an underestimation of decisive factors in the world revolutionary process--world socialism and the international working and communist movement, an overestimation of the national liberation movement, and an understatement of the significance for the fate of the world of the historic opposition of the two social-economic systems--capitalism and socialism. This leads them to an incorrect interpretation of the politics of peaceful coexistence and to support of the theory of "rich" and "poor" nations and the concept of two "superpowers" in one form or another. At the same time, leading detachments of revolutionary democracy which are shifting to the position of scientific socialism are evolving in the direction of proletarian internationalism and becoming ideological enemies of the splitting concept of "rich" and "poor" nations.

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. P. Agafonov (MGU [Moscow State University] imeni M. V. Lomonosov) pointed in his presentation to the social sources and essence of the concepts of non-Marxist socialism in Latin American countries. He emphasized that inasmuch as the primary moving force in this region in the struggle for full political and economic independence is the proletariat, ideological struggle here is developing primarily as an opposition of Marxist-Leninist ideology to neocolonialist and local reactionary theories and to reformist and right-revisionist and "left"-revisionist concepts and ideas.

Meanwhile, attention should be given to the fact that there are serious anti-imperialist and anticapitalist trends in the social-economic and political concepts advanced by democratically inclined petty-bourgeois ideologists which bring them nearer to scientific socialism. A process of dissociation of class forces is becoming stronger in the liberation and democratic movements under the effects of an aggravation of class struggle on the continent and the considerable successes of

real socialism, and there is a gradual freeing of workers from the influence of the ideology of bourgeois nationalism and reformism and perception of the ideas of scientific socialism.

The speaker said further that leftist trends of the most varied shades have appeared in Latin American countries along with communist parties and the socialist parties and groupings which are traditional here. Among these leftist trends are those which proclaim socialism as the goal of their struggle. Noting their divergence with these trends with respect to strategic concepts and tactics, communist parties must take into account that some of these trends are guided by the sincere desire to put an end to imperialist oppression and shift to genuinely socialist positions. At the same time, communist parties do not conceal their differences with these trends and will be able to discern in them the erroneous positions from adventuristic actions which they condemn.

Communists do not make ideological compromises. They reveal for the working masses the complete groundlessness and reactionary nature of bourgeois ideology and of all forms and varieties of anticommunism and antisovietism. They come out against the conciliatory reformist theories and practice of right socialists and criticize sectarian and "leftist"-dogmatic concepts of the adherents and followers of Maoism on the Latin American continent.

The question of the influence of Marxism-Leninism on the views of Kwame Nkrumah was the subject of a presentation by Candidate of Historical Sciences L. N. Lebedinskaya (IML under the CPSU CC). She noted that, with their unquestioned and very rapid evolution toward scientific socialism, Nkrumah's views nevertheless preserved an eclectic nature and class unclearness, which had a noticeable effect on the activities of the party and government of Ghana which he headed.

Nkrumah's system of views on Africa's social problems and the methods of political and economic activity he propagandized were an attempt to tie in the "standards of living" of a traditional African society with certain theses of scientific socialism. With all the clear-cut anticolonial direction of the Convention People's Party, the latter did not receive a sufficiently clear class, theoretical platform, nurtured by populist ideas of the harmony of class interests. In particular, the organizational structure of the NPK [Convention People's Party: CPP] essentially assumed the universal membership of the country's adult population in a particular party organization. In the final analysis the CPP leaders proved to be largely separated from the working people when life set for them tasks requiring consideration of social differentiation and class interests of different layers of society.

Speaking of the prospects for development of socialism in Africa, Nkrumah directly linked it with principles of traditional African society. For example, this comprised one of the theoretical foundations of his program for a noncapitalist path for Ghana. Addressing communist and communal principles, Nkrumah asserted that "socialism can and does serve as protection for communalism under present-day conditions." He was not proceeding from the theory of scientific communism and the theory of socialist revolution to resolution of the issue of the communal structure and communal traditions preserved in African countries, but vice versa. As a result, overestimation of the slogan of communal traditionalism led to a clear

underestimation in the country of the workers' real enemy--the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie and other enemies of a socialist orientation. Nkrumah pictured the path to socialism for African society as a path of rebirth of the communal system freed of colonialism.

In tracing the evolution of Nkrumah's views and activities, one can detect their approach to propositions of Marxism-Leninism on the question of nationalities and a change in his position with respect to socialist countries. Just two months before the overthrow which interrupted Ghana's noncapitalist development, he emphasized that "there exists but one socialism--scientific," simultaneously condemning the theory of national "African" socialism as erroneous.

A prominent representative of Africa's national democracy, Kwame Nkrumah confirmed by his ideological and political development the thesis of Marxism-Leninism about the possibility of the evolution of true world revolutionaries in the direction of a scientific ideology of the working class.

Analyzing the problem of the effect of revolutionary-democratic concepts of socialism in army circles, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Yu. G. Sumbatyan (MGU imeni M. V. Lomonosov) noted that the question of a choice of orientation often depends on the position of army circles under conditions where the political structure of a majority of liberated countries still has not become strong and is in a stage of development, when the level of social-economic development is low, and when the general educational training of the masses of people is low.

Two trends in the social behavior of these circles are apparent at the present-day stage of the national liberation movement: a reactionary trend, where military regimes come to power as a result of military overthrows and they seek contacts with the local bourgeoisie and imperialist states in order to retain political power; and a progressive trend, where democratic army circles connected with the people seize power to prevent or halt the country's further development along the path of capitalism and to direct it along the path of social progress.

Analyzing the complex phenomenon of the development of a revolutionary-democratic ideology among the progressive portion of the military intelligentsia, using a number of African countries with a socialist leaning as an example, the speaker concluded that in a majority of these countries the army played an important and at times decisive role in the struggle for economic independence and social progress, with an important aspect of this struggle being the ideological sphere, without which inclusion of the broad toiling masses in the country's socio-political life is impossible. The development of ideologically progressive, patriotically attuned military circles is the result of an ideological dissociation within the military intelligentsia of African countries during the development of a national liberation revolution into a national democratic revolution and the formation of a socialist-oriented society.

Three stages in the evolution of their views can be identified along this path. In the first stage the revolutionary, patriotically attuned military attempts to free itself of colonialism and neocolonialism in a struggle for national independence, ensure defense of sovereignty, and carry out anti-imperialist and antifeudal social-economic transformations.

In the second stage there is a further evolution of their views involving the need for a further deepening of social-economic transformations, which also must bear an anticapitalist character, i.e., the noncapitalist path of development and a socialist orientation is proclaimed.

In the third stage, as a result of the deepening of the national-democratic revolution and a strengthening of socialist orientation, progressive, patriotically attuned military circles strive to shift to the positions of scientific socialism.

This process meets with great difficulties and complexities primarily involving the presence of a foreign and domestic reaction, which, in the struggle against progressive forces, takes advantage of nationalist, religious and traditional forms of ideology as well as bourgeois ideology for the purpose of influencing the frame of mind and views of the African population.

The speaker said in conclusion that national and people's armies not only experience the influence and effects of socialist ideas, but by their existence they themselves affect the spiritual life of African countries with a socialist leaning. They act as a truly consistent school of the workers' ideological-political, labor, moral and physical indoctrination.

Also participating in the conference was Doctor of Philosophical Sciences P. P. Lopata (IML under the CPSU CC), who gave a report entitled "Real Socialism and the Dissemination of Ideas of Marxism-Leninism in Liberated Countries." Here he emphasized that this process is on the upswing in the present historic stage. Dissemination of the ideas of scientific communism is directly connected with a growth in power of countries of the socialist community. Real socialism, which has become a leading force of the world revolutionary process, exerts an ever-growing influence in the former colonial outskirts of imperialism and in the liberated countries. The clearest manifestation of this process is the existence of an entire group of countries with a socialist leaning in which ideas of scientific socialism have become the leading ideological force.

Summing up the conference's results, M. P. Mchedlov pointed to the importance of work performed from the standpoint of a development of methodological aspects for studying the problem at hand and clarifying the conceptual apparatus. He dwelled on present deficiencies in this respect. In conclusion, Mchedlov thanked all speakers and attendees at the conferences

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1981

6904
CSO: 1807

BRIEFS

DIPLOMATS LEARNING PORTUGUESE--Portuguese-language courses have for some time been stylish with Soviet diplomats. The Foreign Affairs Office of the USSR wants to have available a large number of officers who are fluent in the language spoken in Angola and Mozambique. [Text] [Paris LE POINT in French 30 Mar 81 p 64]

CSO: 1807

NATIONAL

FINNISH PAPER: USSR SCIENTIST ON URALS NUCLEAR ACCIDENT

Helsinki UUSI SUOMI in Finnish 9 Feb 81 p 3

[Pekka Walden article: "Old Assertion Confirmed--Nuclear Accident in the Soviet Union"]

[Text] Jyvaskyla--A powerful nuclear accident occurred in the Soviet Union in the 1950's which caused large areas of the southern Urals to be evacuated.

This assertion, long made in the West, was confirmed on Sunday 8 February by a member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician M. A. Styrikovich, at the Jyvaskyla [University] winter energy conference. This was disclosed by Louis Puiseux, a professor from France.

The accident was said to have occurred in an area used for storing nuclear wastes from military industries. As a result, large quantities of strontium 90 and cesium 137 were dispersed, making habitation impossible over several hundred square kilometers. Academician M. A. Styrikovich claimed that the accident was symptomatic of the preliminary stage of nuclear development, and denied that there are dangers in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

CSO: 3107

AZERI ECONOMISTS DISCUSS IMPACT OF URBANIZATION IN REPUBLIC

Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 6 Jan 81 pp 2-3

[Article by Asef Nadirov, Corresponding member of Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Economic Sciences, and professor, and Sofig Huseynov, Candidate in Economic Sciences: "Urbanization and Economic Development"]

[Text] Intensive upgrading and broadening of the national economy as well as the attraction of natural reserves to productive areas of the country's naturally wealthy rayons are reasons for the continued development of existing cities and the appearance of new cities and city-like towns. Every year now in our country an average of 20 cities and 65 city-like towns appear. At present as much as 63 percent of the country's population lives in cities. Approximately 93 percent of industrial institutions and 95 percent of scientific research institutes and organizations have collected in the cities. This is natural, for cities, as V. I. Lenin has shown, are centers of the economic, political and spiritual life of people and are the main factors in the advance of progress.

Experience shows that the party and the state's successful creation of economic policy for the country and the individual united republics depends greatly upon an analysis of urban problems. Cities reflect on the one hand the level of development of productive forces in the individual united republics and economic regions, and on the other hand the extent of proper location of production in regard to the land. In the example of our republic this will be seen more clearly.

1. In Azerbaijan before the revolution there were a total of 16 cities. Today that number has reached 60. In Tsarist Russia only Baku was recognized as an industrial city. In the period of Soviet administration tens of new industrial cities have appeared. Among these cities are Kirovabad, Sumgait, Ali-Bayramly, Minkechevir, Stepanakert, Dashkesen, etc.

The appearance of cities has played an important role in increasing the economic potential of the rayons in which they are located and in speeding development of all regions of the republic. For example, as much as 14 percent of the industrial output produced in the republic today is contributed by the Kur-Aras economic region, whose importance to the industry of the republic was especially low, more than 11 percent by the Kirovabad-Dashkesen region and 3 percent by the Sheki-Zagatala region.

Effectively relating the development of large and small cities and utilizing the advantages which are peculiar to each of them is one of the most pressing questions of the urban problem. According to the classification of the USSR State Construction Committee's urban expansion organization, cities fall into the following categories by population: below 50 thousand - small; 50 to 100 thousand - medium; 100 to 200 thousand - large; 250 to 500 thousand - very large; and above 500 thousand - largest.

Large and very large cities, in comparison with small and medium cities, have greater potential for developing production and the life of their inhabitants. These cities are recognized as centers where the country's main industries and scientific, administrative, creative and highly specialized cadres gather together. This is also a cause of the population flow to such cities.

With the overconcentration of production and population in very large cities difficulties and contradictions are created which may overshadow those cities' peculiar advantages. These difficulties will, on the one hand, cause a greatly increased cost of the creation, expansion and rebuilding of new infrastructure projects, inconsistencies in production organization, and a certain degree of confusion in the inhabitants' living conditions. On the other hand, in a broader economic perspective they will create difficulties for the development of small and medium cities.

According to the report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress "Main Directions of Economic and Social Development of the USSR in the Period 1981-1985 and Up to the Year 1990" the task has been set forth of limiting the expansion of very large cities, alleviating the pressures of overpopulation within them, and long-range economic developing of small and medium cities.

At present, in 48 of the country's large and very large cities measures are being enacted restricting the placement of new enterprises. These enterprises are being set up in small and medium cities gradually and with longer range perspective. For example, if in 1975 34.5 percent of new enterprises in the country were allotted to large and very large cities, in 1977 this figure was 22 percent.

A great deal more was accomplished in our republic in the ninth and tenth Five-Year Plans in the areas of developing small cities. Thus in the same period larger industrialized enterprises have appeared in the republic's small cities next to enterprises based on local raw materials. It is sufficient to say that 37 of the 112 new large industrial projects which were built and put into operation in the republic in the years from 1971 to 1979 have been constructed in the Baku-Sumgait economic region which has a high level of industrial development, and the remaining 75 have been constructed in other economic regions of Azerbaijan. Strictly as a

result of this in recent years the development of Aghdam, Nakhichevan, Lenkoran, Sheki, Yevlakh, Gazakh and other cities have become stronger.

Notwithstanding this fact, the growth of very large and large cities continues. In the last 20 years the urban population of the Baku-Sumgait economic region has increased by 800 thousand. This is the same as the population growth in Azerbaijan's 58 other cities. Under conditions clearly in line with urban development, with what are the over-rapid development of some very large cities and the slow long-range development of small and medium cities connected?

Investigations and observations show that sometimes many components of new enterprises whose creation is included in the five-year-plan are located in very large cities to take advantage of labor considerations and local raw materials. On the other hand the impetus which already existing institutions in very large cities give to the development of their own rebuilding and expansion is sometimes stronger than newly created enterprises in small cities. This creates even greater socio-economic problems. For example, facts from the last six years (1973-1979) show that only 28 percent of industrial production personnel of the republic are allotted to the rayons with the most labor reserves. Growth in the Baku-Sumgait region, where the labor force is very strained, amounted to 72 percent.

Investigators demonstrate that one of the main reasons for the slow, separate, long-range development of small cities is because "regional interest " in some ministries and main offices is still very strong. Of course the fact that the necessary basis for locating large new enterprises does not exist in most small cities creates certain difficulties. It is clear that such a basis does not create itself. A combined approach to the matter is needed with a view toward the intensive economic development of the rayon. The matter must be analyzed depending on specific conditions.

Of course by no means all small cities possess the potential required for heavy industrial development. For that reason, when placing an entire production force a foundation must be laid for long-range development of small cities with exploitable potential, especially transportation and geographical site. The experience of the Baltic Republics shows that only small cities which have been carefully selected and whose long-range development has been preplanned create conditions for opposing the overconcentration of manufacturing in very large cities, especially capital cities, by more effectively locating their productive forces within the territory of the republic. In this respect the experience of the Lithuanian SSR is worth closer attention. In the last 30 years 10 of the republic's 92 cities were selected as regional centers and placement of most of the republic's new industry in these cities was planned. This kind of planning resisted further concentration of manufacturing in the cities of Vilnius and Kaunas, the main industrial centers, and helped in the equal sharing of industries within the territory of the republic.

Since 93 percent of the cities in our republic are small it is a pity that up to now long-term planned small cities have not been thoroughly determined. The result is that a small city that is accorded a long-range plan in one five-year-plan is overlooked in the next, and so its stable dynamic development as a long-range planned city is not guaranteed. In the 27 July 1976 resolution of the CPSU Central

Committee on the development of diverse industrial areas in Azerbaijan SSR, and in the 22 February 1979 resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "Concerning Measures for Further Specialization of the Agricultural Production of Azerbaijan SSR and Development of Viticulture and Wine Making" the proper selection and approval of such long-range urban and regional cultural and economic centers gain importance in the creation of the broad socio-economic development programs under consideration.

2. The establishment of branches and sections of active enterprises in very large cities can play an important role in the development of small and medium cities. In other republics, especially the neighboring Armenian SSR, most of the existing enterprises in small cities began operation as branches and sections. Presently more than 15 branches of enterprises of the city of Lvov operate in various residential areas of the oblast. One of the sections of Popov imya Riga Radio Factory moved to the city of Kandeva and the entire complement of 500 workers for the section was made up of local workers.

In our republic, too, a lot of work has been done in this field. Some factories in Nakhichevan, Stepanakert and Salyan were originally branches of Baku enterprises and have become independent and advanced institutions. It is consistent with the goal to continue on an even broader scale the work of creating in small cities branches of large enterprises of Baku and Sumgait. There are exploitable possibilities for this in most cities of the republic.

The transfer of certain very large city enterprises with simple technologies to small and medium cities is a most important matter. In their place enterprises must be created which have a more complex technology born of the production requirements of very large cities. This is consistent with the advantageous development of cities whether very large or small. For example, relocation of Baku factories for repair of agricultural machinery and the manufacture of its spare parts to rayons of the republic which have the greatest demand and to cities with long-range plans would be beneficial. It is a pity that still not enough effort is being applied to the relocation of such enterprises from Baku. On the contrary, the locating in Baku and its surroundings of enterpises which are consistent with population and administrative demands of the other rayons of the republic is being continued by some ministries and agencies. A factory which manufactures concrete poles for the republic's vineyards and similar large agricultural enterprises and several kinds of light food product industries in the cities of Baku-Sumgait exemplify what we have said.

Establishment of appropriate industrial areas which are based on the complex exploitation of existing local reserves will not only enable the creation of conditions conducive to attracting the population of small and medium cities to socialist production, but will also improve the economy of the rayons in which these cities are located. For example, the establishment of a construction material production complex based on rich local reserves near the cities of Aghdam, Gazakh, Sheki and Zagatala will assist in supplying the surrounding rayons with construction material.

In the experience of fraternal socialist countries a number of concessions are established by the proper organizations for locating industrial enterprises in newly populated rayons and small cities, for creating infrastructure projects and also for attracting specialized cadres to these rayons. A number of industrial centers in our country have experience in uniting the efforts of existing enterprises to create infrastructure projects in the city. Through the united efforts of these enterprises urban communication systems, residential buildings, children's parks, schools, cultural-civic projects, etc. are being created.

The potential in this area of the small cities of our republic is, to a certain extent, limited. On the one hand, in some of them there are few industrial enterprises, on the other hand the productive capacity of existing enterprises is low and, therefore, their effect upon the social development of the cities is not so great. More rapid industrial progress in small cities will increase this effect.

3. Investigations show that in Azerbaijan, unlike most other republics in our country, the central administrative functions of most small cities are in place. These cities appear to be main centers for supplying the demands of the rayon's villages and other residential areas for a broad range of cultural-civic and other services. Just as resources are diverted from enterprises of industrial centers to social development, resources for the social development of small cities should also be diverted, according to a plan, from the industrial enterprises therein, from the other appropriate offices and organizations of the rayon and from the common income of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and centralized in the executive committees of the Soviets of People's Deputies. This will be the basis for the combined development both of cities and of the integrated rayon, and for the successful location there of new large enterprises in the future.

Development of small cities is not only an economic problem, it is a social problem which acquires importance for the entire nation. Therefore, close attention to the problem of the development of small cities must become one of the main tasks of planning organs, scientific offices and other related organizations. This is an important condition for resisting the flow of population from villages to very large cities, for further enriching cultural life there and for making efficient use of labor reserves.

9737
CSO: 1810

END

END OF FICHE DATE FILMED

23 April 1981